

THE
REMARKS

Lately Published on

Three Treatises

OF THE
PLAGUE,

- R. Viz.*
I. Dr. Mead's *Short Discourse*.
II. Dr. Mead's *Short Discourse Explain'd*.
III. Dr. Pye's *Discourse of the Plague*.

WITH SOME
ADDITIONAL NOTES.

LONDON,

Printed for J. ROBERTS near the Oxford-Arms
in Warwick-Lane. M. DCC. XXII.

THE
REMARKS

First Published on

Three Treatises

OF THE

PLAGUE

IN

I. Dr. Mead's Second Discourse.

II. Dr. Mead's Second Discourse, Continued.

III. Dr. Mead's Third Discourse, of the Plague.

WITH SOME

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

LONDON,

Printed and Sold by J. KNEELAND, at the Sign of the Anchor, in St. Dunstons Church-yard, near St. Dunstons Church, in the County of Middlesex.

The REMARKS lately Published on Three Treatises of the PLAGUE, &c.

WHENCE the Pestilence may have its rise, and whether it can or cannot be communicated by Persons and Commerce, are Questions absolutely necessary to be determined before any Measures or Methods can rightly be established, either for keeping off, or preserving from that destructive Enemy of Mankind. I could wish therefore, since this Matter is now brought in debate before the Publick, that whoever shall set himself to write upon this Subject, will make it his principal aim to contribute something towards clearing up these important Points.

Amongst many others who have appear'd in Print of late, a nameless Author has given us some Remarks on three Treatises of the Plague, viz. *Dr. Mead's Short Discourse*; *Dr. Mead's Short Discourse Explain'd*; and, *Dr. Pye's Discourse*. But the Writer of these Remarks, instead of furnishing any new Light to the Enquiry, has done what he can to puzzle and obscure it; and has endeavour'd

to impose on his Readers Fallacies and Falsehoods for Reasoning and Truth.

As soon as I had looked into this Performance, which I did upon seeing the Advertisement in the *Post-Boy* of the Fifth of *December*, I conceived it might be of use to point out some of the false Quotations, Fallacies, &c. in short Notes, to be published together with those Quotations and Remarks.

In pursuing this Design, I have thought it proper to take notice of such Passages only, as are argumentative, and which may some way or other relate to the foregoing Questions: Wherefore I shall purposely omit several of the Quotations taken from the Treatise entitled, *Dr. Mead's Short Discourse Explained*: But there being little else than Argument in *Dr. Pye's Discourse*, at least in the first part of it, I shall not pass by any of the Remarks thereon. The Omissions here mentioned seemed to me the more requisite, not only that my Pamphlet might not become unsizeable; but likewise, since the Author of that Treatise says in his Preface, that he design'd it only as a Protest against *Dr. Mead's Method of Writing*, &c. the Repetition of any thing not immediately necessary to the End in view, might be thought superfluous and impertinent.

Having given this brief Account of my Design, I proceed to animadvert on the Remarks.



S E C T I

Remarker.

I Shall begin with the Gentleman that takes upon him to be Dr. Mead's Explainer.

Note. A very difficult Task!

Explainer, p. 3. 'Nothing follows (*viz.* in Dr. Mead's Book) either concerning Contagion, or the Manner of its acting.

Remark. This is a gross Falsity. Is not the first Part of Dr. Mead's Discourse chiefly about the Causes that spread the Plague, and consequently of the Contagion which accompanies it? And is it not shewn, in Pages 15, 16, how the contagious Atoms seize a sound Person; that is, the Manner by which Contagion acts? Dr. Mead has not indeed gone about to prove in Form the Existence of Contagion, that being needless.

Note. It is certainly needless to go about to prove the Existence of any thing, that, like other Chimera's, has no Existence, but in the Brain only: But for that reason Dr. Mead seems to have been imitating the German, who wrote several large Volumes in order to account for a certain Phenomena; when upon farther Enquiry it was found, there never had been any such Phenomena. Moreover, the Account given by Dr. Mead, concerning the manner in which Contagion is communicated, is shewn by Dr. Pye repugnant to Nature.

Explainer, p. 3. 'The most antient and best Physicians knew nothing of Contagion, and far less of Pestilential Contagion; Words only brought in by Physicians in later Times, and of Ignorance.

Re-

Remark. ' The Use of the Word *Contagion*, or *Infection*, which signifies the same Thing, is no Mark of Ignorance, but necessary to express a real Thing. I suppose, it will not be doubted, that the Small-Pox is contagious, and much less that the *Lues Venerea* is so; tho both these Distempers were unknown to the most antient Physicians. The Words are useful, and likewise rightly apply'd (in the Opinion of most Men) to the Plague.

Note. It is not only doubted whether the Small-Pox is contagious; but if Dr. *Pye's* Arguments against the Plague, taken from the nature of the Disease, and the manner of its being discharged, be applied to the Small-Pox, they will prove absolutely that it is not. Neither is the *Lues Venerea* infectious to the By-standers, or by external Contact. However, what is here asserted is true, viz. That the antient Physicians had no notion of Pestilential Contagion.

Explainer, p. 7. ' Is a Concurrence of all the supposed Causes necessary to make a Plague? Then there never was a Plague in the World.

Remark. ' This Dr. *Mead* does not say; but only that more than one of them is necessary: For no more than that do his Words signify, *That a Concurrence of Causes produces Diseases of this Kind*; Short Discourse, p. 4.

Note. Dr. *Mead's* Words are, ' From hence it appears to be a Concurrence of Causes that produces Diseases of this kind, which must not only meet, but exert their Force together for a considerable time: And when this happens, their first Effect is a degree of Stagnation in the Air, which is afterwards followed by Corruption and Putrefaction.' It may deserve Notice, that Dr. *Mead* does not only make it necessary, that
more

more than one Cause should meet and concur, but likewise that they must exert their Force together for a considerable time; which therefore must be done by the Air, and the Atoms emitted from sick Persons. Consequently the Atoms cannot infect others near the Sick, however close they may be, because they cannot have been united with the Air, nor have exerted their Force together with it for a considerable time. And this entirely destroys all the Notion of Contagion, or of communicating the Disease from one Person to another.

Explainer, p. 8. 'Hard and continued frosty Weather produces the Pestilence, most commonly, in our Northern Climates.

Remark. 'This is utterly false; for the Plague is never produced here without imported Contagion; and besides, cold Weather is known to resist it very much. Did not the Plague stop very much last Winter in *France*, so that at *Marseilles* they thought themselves well nigh clear of it? and did not it break out again when the Weather grew hot? The Contagion which brought the Plague among us last Time was brought at the latter End of the Year 1664; but did it not lie quiet without destroying above half a score Persons all the cold Weather, till the Summer Heat put it in Action? and did not the next Winter wholly suppress it?

Note. It is much easier to say a thing is false, than to prove it so. Whence was the last Plague at *Hamburg* brought? And of all the Plagues that have happen'd here in *England*, can it be made appear in any one Instance, that it has been imported: If it cannot, and I am certain it cannot, the Assurance of this Writer is somewhat uncommon. As to the Questions he asks in relation to the

the Plague in France; I answer, That it was so far from being stopped, or being abated, by the Cold, that it continued spreading all the Winter, and particularly at *Thoulon*, where it did not begin till *January*; and the Violence of it was greatly abated there in *April* following, and it continued to decrease more and more, as the Weather became hotter and hotter. This appears by the Accounts from thence, printed in the *Daily Courant* and the *Gazettes*: And we see the Cold does not prevent its spreading this Winter. Hence it is evident, that the Plague in France does not at all depend on the heat of the Weather, which is commonly supposed necessary to the production of it in *Turkey*. And hence it may be concluded too, that the Pestilence in France is from a Cause different from those whence it is usually produced in *Turkey*.

Explainer, p. 9. If we consult the *Paris Article* in the *London Gazette* for *July 21st, 1721*; there it is said, that the *Court* has received a Letter from the *Marquis de Pons*, who commands at *Thoulon*, with Advice, that the hot Weather had much diminished the Plague in that City.

Remark. All that follows from hence is, that the *Marquis de Pons* was mistaken as to the Cause which made the Plague abate at *Thoulon*. For the Accounts of all Plagues shew, that usually they occasion the greatest Mortality in the hottest Season; which was manifestly the Case of our last Plague.

Note. The *Marquis de Pons* gives an account of the Matter of Fact, which all the Accounts from thence confirm: Whence it follows, that the hot Weather was neither necessary to the producing nor propagating the Plague in France.

Explainer, p. 21. It is asserted by those who oppose this Contagion, that a Plague is sometimes

bred

bred without it, otherwise it would be perpetual — Contagion may propagate, but not begin a Plague.

Remark. Dr. Mead says, the Plague is originally bred in the Southern Parts of the World by Putrefaction and the ill Qualities of the Air, and not in these Countries; but is spread into these Countries by Contagion.

Note. If the Putrefaction, and ill Qualities of the Air, can produce the Pestilence in the Southern Parts of the World; what Reason can be given why they should not be capable of doing it here? I am satisfied neither this Writer, nor his Patron, will ever be able to assign a sufficient one.

Explainer, p. 24. I aver, that it may be demonstrated from the Nature of the Plague, that it never, or very rarely, is communicated from one Person to another.

Remark. This is a gross Absurdity; for, were it Fact, it were impossible to demonstrate it from any thing yet known to Mankind, of the Nature of the Disease.

Note. Dr. Pye has demonstrated from the Nature of the Disease, that it cannot possibly be communicated from the Sick to Persons standing near, nor even by common Contact. See Dr. Pye's *Discourse of the Plague*, p. 65.

Explainer, p. 24, 25. At present, we will content our selves to evince this Truth by a Demonstration from Observation, and I will borrow it from Mr. Graunt: In his Observations on the Plague in 1636, he says, it lasted 12 Years; in 8 whereof there died 2000 per Annum, and never under 800; the which shews, That the Contagion of the Plague depends more upon the DISPOSITION of the AIR,

‘ than upon the *EFFLUVIA* from the Bodies of
‘ Men.

Remark. ‘ What is produced from *Graunt* only
‘ shews the Concurrence of some ill Quality
‘ necessary, according to *Dr. Mead*’s Opinion.

Note. We will add the remaining part of this
Quotation — * Which also we prove by the sudden
Jumps which the Plague hath made, leaping in one
Week from 118 to 927, and back again from 993 to
258; and from thence again, the very next Week, to
852. — Since then the Effluvia from Mens Bo-
dies cannot be conceived capable of such great and
sudden Alterations and Variations; the Effects
here mentioned, as *Mr. Graunt* observes, must ne-
cessarily be owing to the Alterations and Changes
in the Air, independent of the Effluvia from Mens
Bodies.

Explainer, p. 27. ‘ What Account can be given
‘ to Merchants, for their Goods serving *Quaran-*
‘ *tane*? &c.

Remark. ‘ In all that is here said concerning
‘ Goods performing *Quarantane*, *Dr. Mead* is
‘ treated, as if he advised a new Practice upon an
‘ Opinion peculiar to himself; whereas it is the
‘ general and current Opinion of the World, as
‘ appears by the Custom of performing *Quaran-*
‘ *tanes* in most Places: And therefore, without a-
‘ ny additional Reasons, the Practice ought to be
‘ continued, till it can be proved very undeniably,
‘ that this is a Mistake; seeing the Consequences
‘ of neglecting it, if it should prove true, may be
‘ very fatal.

* *Graunt*’s Observations, p. 71.

Note.

Note. Dr. *Pye* has shewn throughout his whole Discourse, and particularly in the fifth and sixth Sections, that Quarantanes are not sufficient, or even useful, for keeping off the Plague; but that they may be more likely the means of bringing it amongst us.

Explainer, p. 29. ' Another new Conceit the Doctor would entertain us with, that the Matter of the Plague is an *Animal Juice*: But pray, good Doctor, of what Animal?

Remark. ' Is not Man an Animal? and are not the infectious Effluvia, supposed by Dr. *Mead*, to be emitted from Men sick of the Plague?

Note. Dr. *Mead* says in the 18th Page of his Discourse, That the Plague is a real Poison bred in the Southern and Eastern Parts only; and here it is said to be from an Animal Juice. But if the cause of the Pestilence be an Animal Juice bred in Men, it certainly may be generated here, as well as any where else. How can these things be reconciled?

Explainer, p. 33, 34. ' The Pestilence has never taken a Journey hither, in all appearance, these fifty five Years past: In all that Time *Turkey Goods* (*viz.* such Goods as come from Places where Plagues frequently happen) have not serv'd a Quarantane; a certain Proof that Goods very seldom, or ever, bring a Plague into a Country; and oftner find it there, than propagate it.

Remark. ' Here is proved no such Thing: It is not so much as absolutely proved, that infected Goods can ever be brought into a Country without infecting it; for Goods packed up in a Town or Port where the Plague is, may not always receive the Infection. But upon Dr. *Mead's*

Principles, infected Goods may sometimes be brought without Hurt, when the Air is in a right State; and that the Plague is caused only when the Infection from Goods and an ill State of Air meet together.

Note. The Trade from *Turkey* is greatly encreased since the Year 1665; so that since that time there has been more risque and greater likelihood of having the Pestilence brought from thence, than there was before (*i. e.* if it were to be brought in Goods) and yet before that time we were seldom free from it, perhaps not for any longer time together than they are in *Turkey*; and since the Year 1665, notwithstanding the increase of Trade, &c, we have never once been visited with it. Hence it may very reasonably be concluded, That the frequent Pestilences we had formerly, were not occasioned by means of Commerce.

Explainer, p. 35, 36. Dr. *Hodges* says, in the Winter 1665, when the People returned to *London*, they readily took Possession of such Houses wherein Persons had died of the Plague, &c. without any ill Consequences; Which overturns Dr. *Mead*'s Notions.

Remark. What Dr. *Hodges* says, only proves the Air to have received such a healthy State, as dissipated and suppressed the Malignity.

Note. Take the rest of the Quotation from *Hodges*. And even, what is almost beyond Belief, those Citizens who before were afraid of their Friends and Relations, would, without Fear, venture into the Houses and Rooms where infected Persons had but a little before breathed their last; Nay, such Comforts did inspire the languishing People, and such Confidence, that many went into the Beds where Persons had died, before they were even cold, or cleansed from the stench of

of the Disease.' Here it is expressly affirm'd, that those who went near the Sick, and even into their Beds, did not catch the Sickneſs; and yet the Peſtilence was very far from being ceaſed at that time: for Dr. *Hodges* tells us this was done the beginning of *November*, in the firſt Week of which Month there died of the Plague 1414, and in the ſecond Week 1050. Wherefore ſince thoſe who acted in the manner above related, received no Injury, even tho' the Peſtilence ſtill raged exceedingly; we muſt conclude, that the Peſtilence depended entirely on the Conſtitution of the Air, and was not at all communicative from ſick Perſons.

Explainer, p. 42. 'What real Security does he acquire, when his Reason is convinc'd, that the Plague of Peſtilence is not begot by any *Contagion*, properly ſpeaking? That this Plague is not propagated from the Body of a ſick Perſon into the Body of a ſound.

Remark. 'This Confidence, if it be ill ground'd, may chance to coſt any one dear.

Note. It appears by the Paſſage lately quoted from Dr. *Hodges*, that this Confidence, ſo far from coſting any one dear, did in reality and fact produce good Effects, even to Admiration.

Explainer, p. 45. 'Is any Plague in a Country without Conſequence?

Remark. 'Without great Conſequence, it ſhould have been; for that is Dr. *Mead*'s Expreſſion, which this Paſſage is deſign'd to ridicule. But the Queſtion is eaſily answer'd; for ſhould the Plague infect a Houſe or two only, and then ſtop, it would not be of great Conſequence. And I believe the Aſſertion of Dr. *Mead* to be certainly true, that there never was any Diſtemper of great Conſequence among us, that is, which cau-

ſed

‘ fed a great Mortality, and was called the Plague,
 ‘ but was imported from abroad. I am sure, no-
 ‘ thing has been advanced, why we should not be-
 ‘ lieve as much.

Note. When it affects so few as this Remarker speaks of, it is no Pestilence. Can it be said, that any Country or Town is afflicted with the Plague of Pestilence, when no more of the People die than at other times? Does not the Term Pestilence necessarily signify a destructive Sickneſs extended over a Town or Country? What then can these Men mean, or what Ideas can they have in their Brains, when they talk in this manner of the Plague of Pestilence?

Explainer, p. 57. ‘ He has not been pleas’d to
 ‘ tell us where the Plague first begins, and in
 ‘ what manner it travels into distant Countries.

Remark. ‘ Both these Assertions are false; for
 ‘ Dr. Mead says, p. 4, 5. *Plagues* seem to be of
 ‘ the Growth of the Eastern (that is, the hot
 ‘ Parts of the East) and Southern Parts of the
 ‘ World, and to be transmitted from them into
 ‘ colder Climates, by the way of Commerce.

Note. Dr. Mead says, *Plagues* are generated in the Eastern and Southern parts of the World: But sure he does not mean all the parts of the World that are from us Eastward and Southward, for these are nine Tenths of it: And yet if this be not his meaning, we are as much in the dark, with respect to the place of its Birth, as if he had said nothing.

Explainer, p. *ibid.* ‘ We have seen an Original
 ‘ *English* Plague, that came from no place in the
 ‘ World.

Remark. ‘ I suppose here is meant, the Sweat-
 ‘ ing Sickneſs; but this is only a confident Asser-
 ‘ tion, without any Proof, against what Dr. Mead
 ‘ has

‘ has said of it ; the Symptoms were changed from those of the common Plague, by the benign Influence of our Air ; does it therefore certainly follow, that it was not derived from the common Plague ?

Note. This is not a confident Assertion only, but a Fact that has all the Evidence that a Fact can possibly have ; for it has the concurrent Testimony of all the Writers of those Times. Neither can this Remarker produce one single Author who lived in or near those Times, who does so much as insinuate that the Sweating Sickness was brought to us from abroad. But this Matter is more fully manifested in Dr. Pye’s Discourse, p. 33, &c.

Explainer, p. 61. ‘ It appears by the *Paris Article* in the *Post-Man*, Aug. 26. that the exceeding great Care of the Civil Magistrate has proved unsuccessful.

Remark. ‘ It does not then appear to have been hurtful.

Note. Here is a false Quotation, for the Article from the *Post-Man*, as it is recited by the Author of *Dr. Mead’s Discourse Explained*, is as follows : ‘ The Council of Health sits three Days in a Week to find out other Methods, since Lines, &c. will not do.’ From this Article rightly quoted it appears, that the Council of Health were made sensible from Experience that the use of Lines would not answer ; and if so, considering the Want and Distress, the Uneasinesses and Distractions of Mind, &c. necessarily occasioned by Restraints, it follows, that those Methods must have been very mischievous and destructive.

Explainer, p. 62. ‘ The same learned Author (*Mercurialis*) informs us, that burning infected Goods was found to do great Mischief in a Plague in Padua.

Re-

Remark. A Judicious Author would have been
 more to the purpose than Learned, had this been
 his true Character. The Case here mentioned
 is yet disputable, and can only be decided by Ex-
 perience, which yet we have not, in a sufficient
 degree, to determine the Case absolutely: whence
 Dr. Mead has left it doubtful; advising, at the
 end of his Book, to bury Goods deep under
 Ground, if burning be thought unsafe.
 Perhaps it may be thought, that I here speak
 too slightly of so very learned a Man as *Mercurialis*;
 it may therefore be expected I should pro-
 duce some Proof to confirm this my Sentiment of
 him: At present I shall give one out of his Trea-
 tise of the Plague. In his sixteenth Chapter he
 sets down one of their Arguments, who are of
 opinion that the Plague has not its Origin from
 the Air, in these Words: *Secundo ratiocinamur,*
quod, si aer fuisset origo aliquo modo hujus pestis (Ve-
netæ & Patavinæ). cum aer sit corpus continuum, de-
beret etiam ejus inquinatio continua esse: & idcirco
cum Venetiæ, & hæc nostra urbs fuerint infectæ, de-
buisse etiam infici necessario Vicia, Tarvisum, &
suburbia omnia Patavina, quod tamen scimus non eve-
nisse; immo vero dicunt experientia comprobatum esse,
loca, valde proxima illis quæ erant peste affecta, fuisse
omnino immunia. To this Argument *Mercurialis*,
 in his seventeenth Chapter, thus answers: *Ad*
secundam horum argumentationem respondeo, aerem
quidem totum sibiipso continuum esse; verum tamen ne-
quaquam necesse esse, ut una pars aeris contaminata,
simul & semel totus aer contaminetur: id namque si
verum esset, sequeretur necessario, in omni peste totum
terrarum orbem debere eodem tempore peste tentari;
quod tamen a nemine fuit unquam memoriæ proditum,
ut etiam exemplis demonstrabo. Now, doubtless,
 a Writer cannot be much applauded for his Judg-
 ment,

ment, who could think the setting an Opponent's Argument in the strongest Light, is making an Answer to it.

Note. *Mercurialis* having taken notice that *Hippocrates* and all the antient Physicians laid it down, that the true Pestilence was always from the Air, is here endeavouring to prove, that the Pestilence which had raged a little before at *Padua* and *Venice*, was from the Air too, and therefore a true Pestilence: That he might do this the more convincingly, he states very fully, and then answers all the Objections that were or could be made against his Opinion; one of which this Writer has quoted, viz. ' If the Air was the Origin of this Pestilence, since the Air is a Body continuous, its evil Disposition should have been so too; and therefore it would likewise necessarily have infected *Vicentia*, *Tarvisum*, and all the other Places about *Padua*. ' It may be observed, that at this time, viz. 1577, the modern Notion of conveying the Pestilence from Place to Place by Persons or Goods, was but young; and there was no one who had as yet denied, that the Pestilence was not generally occasioned by an unhealthy Constitution of Air: And even this Remarker does allow, that in some Countries the Cause of it is in the Air. Accordingly *Mercurialis*, in answer to the Objection, argues that tho the Air be continuous to itself, it is not for all that necessary that one part of the Air being contaminated, the whole Body of Air should thence become so too: for then it would follow, that in every Pestilence [arising from the Air] the whole World would be afflicted with it at the same time; which is a thing has never happened, as I shall demonstrate by several Instances. He goes on to give divers very good Reasons, why the Air may be rendered unhealthy at some one Place, and yet

C

that

that Unhealthiness not be extended to a Place or Country at some distance. Now I pray, which has shewn himself the most Judicious, the learned *Mercurialis*, or this presumptuous Carper?

SECT II.

Remarker.

‘ I Come now to consider *Dr. Pye’s Discourse of the Plague*, &c. wherein he has taken upon him to be *Dr. Mead’s Refuter*.

Note. A very necessary Undertaking it was.

Refuter, in the Preface, p. v. ‘ If the People are made to believe the Plague is communicated from sick Persons, and by Commerce, of course they will be afraid of catching it, and thereby be necessitated to pass their Lives in continual Fears and Apprehensions of something very dreadful and deadly.

Remark. ‘ This is a Mistake; for People do believe this, and yet do not pass their Lives in continual Fears and Apprehensions. When they are in extraordinary Danger, it is fit they should fear.

Note. Every one’s daily Conversation will satisfy him of the truth of what *Dr. Pye* has said. When People are in the most extraordinary Danger, it would then be the most happy for them to be free from Fear.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ If the Plague can be conveyed by Commerce, then Quarantanes are proper and requisite.

Remark. ‘ Here this Refuter contradicts himself; for he employs §. 6. of this Book to shew

‘ the

the contrary, viz. that tho Quarantanes would keep out the Plague, yet it would not be proper to enjoin them.

Note. Dr. Pye says, If the Notion obtains that the Plague can be conveyed by Commerce, then Quarantanes are proper and requisite for keeping it out. And afterwards, in his sixth Section, he endeavours to prove, That tho Quarantanes are proper and requisite, or even sufficient for keeping it out; yet it is not the Interest of this Nation, consider'd as a trading Nation, to enjoin the performance of them. Where is the Contradiction?

Refuter, ibid. p. v, vi. Fears and Frights expose us greatly to the Evil we are most afraid of. This is commonly seen in the Case of the Small-Pox.

Remark. Will Fears and Frights of themselves produce the Disease? If not, they may be of use to stir us up to sufficient Watchfulness against it. How comes the Small-Pox here to be mentioned? when in p. 10. of this Preface there are these Words: Tho the Small-Pox is a peculiar Distemper, whence nothing could be rightly argued with respect to the Plague, &c. A second Contradiction.

Note. Dr. Pye here infers the power of Fears and Frights, from Instances in the case of the Small-Pox: And in p. 10. he says, Nothing can be rightly argued from the Small-Pox to prove the Infectiousness of the Plague. Therefore, according to this Writer, because the Contagion of the Plague cannot be proved from the Small-Pox, it is a contradiction to shew from thence the great operative Force of Fears and Frights.

Refuter, ibid. p. vi. If these Notions prevail, and the Plague should happen among us, the Sick will be deserted by Friends, Relations, &c.

Remark. ‘ Does this affect the Truth of these
 ‘ Notions? or are these Inconveniences great e-
 ‘ nough to make it proper to impose upon Man-
 ‘ kind?

Note. Dr. Pye is here endeavouring to stir Peo-
 ple up to look into the Truth and Evidence of
 Things; and far from imposing on Mankind, the
 whole Design of this Preface is to caution them a-
 gainst Prejudice and Imposition.

Refuter, *ibid.* p. vii. ‘ In short, shutting up Peo-
 ‘ ple within Walls or Lines, is shutting them a-
 ‘ midst, and exposing them to Famine, Plunder,
 ‘ Murder, Pestilence and Despairs.

Remark. ‘ Inclosing the infected Places with a
 ‘ Line, as practised in *France*, does not expose
 ‘ them to Famine; because it is the Care of the
 ‘ Guards to see them furnished by the Country :
 ‘ Nor to Plunder and Murder; for it is the Execu-
 ‘ tion of the Law upon Offenders in those Kinds,
 ‘ which protect all Places against them, and Jus-
 ‘ tice is not obstructed by those Lines; on the con-
 ‘ trary, they effectually hinder Criminals from ef-
 ‘ caping Punishment by running away. And the
 ‘ two other Evils, Pestilence and Despair, Dr. Mead
 ‘ has provided against, by proposing, that all who
 ‘ will, be suffered to leave the infected Place, ha-
 ‘ ving first performed Quarantane in an airy Place
 ‘ within the Line, p. 54.

Note. What Dr. Pye here says, is evinced beyond
 contradiction by the Accounts from *Marseilles*, and
 from Dr. Hodges. Quincy’s *Translation of Hodges*,
 p. 8.

Refuter, p. xi. ‘ He (Dr. Mead) should not
 ‘ have bid publick Defiance as a Champion, till he
 ‘ had, &c.

Remark. ‘ Bidding publick Defiance is to oppose
 ‘ the common Opinion of the World, as this Re-
 ‘ futer;

Refuter; not to close with it, and clear up the Difficulties which clog it.

Note. He that first enters the List, bids the Defiance; and at every Coronation the Champion is properly said to bid publick Defiance, tho the general Opinion be in favour of the King then crowned.

Refuter, in the Book, Ch. I. p. 1. 'That the Plague is a Sickness or Disease, and not a real Poison, as Dr. Mead says, perhaps by Mistake.

Remark. 'Perhaps this is no Mistake in Dr. Mead; for it may be both. Is not the Madness of Dogs a Disease in them? and yet all Authors agree in ranking them among the poisonous Animals; and when they communicate their Disease to other Creatures by biting, are they not said to poison those Creatures?

Note. If this be no Mistake, either there is no difference between the Cause and the Effect, or Dr. Mead was as ignorant and senseless as his Remarker.

Refuter, p. 1. 'That the Symptoms of the Plague in different Countries, and at different Times in the same Country, have been very various and different.

Remark. 'This is not true; there is usually no other Difference than what arises from the different Degrees of its Violence, or the Difference of Constitutions it seizes; as the comparing together the Descriptions of Authors fully shews, and is taught in particular by Diemerbroek, l. 1. c. 7. in *Notis* §. 2.

Note. This Writer first asserts, that what Dr. Pye has said is not true; and yet by saying in the very next Words, there is usually no other difference, he supposes that sometimes there is a difference; and consequently he allows that what Dr. Pye has said is

is true. And as to the comparing together the Descriptions of Authors, it will appear from thence, that the Descriptions have been almost always various and different; which this Writer, whatever he may do in Mask, and whilst he thinks himself concealed, would not have the Assurance to do out of his Disguise.

Refuter, p. 2. ' From these Observations it is evident, that the Plague is not always one and the same Disease.

Remark. ' This is not evident; for the Observations here referred to, are in the Sentence preceding, and in this other, viz. that there is not any one, or at least not any one distinguishing Symptom, which constantly accompanies it. ' The Mistake of the first of these I have already shewn; and from this last it cannot be concluded, that the Plague is not one and the same Disease: for is not the Small-Pox allowed always to be the same Disease? and yet there is no one distinguishing Symptom which constantly accompanies it; for in some few Cases Persons have died of it, before any Eruptions have appeared: in which this Distemper resembles the Plague, for the Plague is never known to be without Tumours or Carbuncles, if the Diseased survive the first Attack of it.

Note. In a great many Pestilences, particularly that called the Sweating Sickness, none had Tumours or Carbuncles; and in the last Plague here in London, there are some Instances of Persons who recovered without them. See Quincy's Edit. of Hodges, p. 84, 107, 129.

Refuter, p. 2. ' And that it (the Plague) does not always arise from one and the same Cause, may be made appear, not only from the foregoing, but from many other Observations.

Re-

Remark. What the other Observations are which are not set down, I know not; none of the foregoing will do it: For is not the Small-Pox allowed always to arise from the same Cause, tho the Symptoms of it are as different in different Subjects, as the Symptoms of the Plague?

Note. The Small-Pox, if it proceeds, has always one, if not more, constant Symptom, viz. Pustules; whereas the Plague many times has been attended neither with Buboes nor Carbuncles.

Refuter, p. 2. But I think one Instance sufficient. Dr. Keyes*, speaking of the Sweating Sicknesses in England and Germany, makes the following Remark: *Moreover these (the Germans) are not hurt with our Air and Contagion, but with their own; and our own infects us, and not that of theirs: Our Contagion of this Year shews the former, and theirs of the Year 1529 confirms the latter.*

Remark. What is here brought from Dr. Keyes, can only prove the Cause of the Sweating Sickness not wholly to be lodged in the Air; which is the Use Dr. Keyes makes of it: but it will not prove that the Cause of that Disease was not the same. On the contrary, seeing the Germans had it in the Year 1529, it is not improbable that they contracted the Contagion from us, who were molested with it the Year before.

Note. I shall add the rest of this Argument, by which the Reader will be enabled to judge of this Remark.

Here we see, that the Cause, whatever it was, which affected the Germans, did not hurt

us; and the Cause which injured us, did not affect the *Germans*: This could not have been, if the Causes had not been different; for that which did not produce the Sickness in us, could not be the same with that which did: and that the Difference did not consist in degree of Strength and Force only, is plain, because that which did not hurt us, did yet destroy the *Germans*, as strong and hale a People as we. And if the Difference did not consist in degree of Strength and Force, then it must have been a Difference in Nature and Kind.

Refuter, p. 5, 6. ' In the second Page of this (Dr. *Mead*'s) Discourse, the Doctor assigns three Causes of the Pestilence; the Air, diseased Persons, and Goods transported from infected Places. The first of these is supported in that and the next Page, and proved, &c. But a little farther all this is forgotten, and the Doctor contradicts what himself before had been proving: for in Page 14. he says, " On the other hand it is evident, that Infection is not received from the Air it self, however pre-disposed, without the Concurrence of something emitted from infected Persons.

Remark. ' Here is no Contradiction; for Dr. *Mead* has no where endeavoured to prove, that the Air, in these Countries at least, of it self, or alone, can produce the Plague: On the other hand, his whole Design has been to prove the contrary. He only shews, that the Air is one of the Causes which must concur to give rise to it; and that it can hardly, or not at all, spread far, without Assistance from some ill Qualities of the Air.

Note. Dr. *Mead* has endeavoured to prove, that the Air can and does produce infectious Diseases without

without the Concurrence of something emitted from diseased Persons, as may be seen in Page 2. and 3. of his Discourse.

Refuter, p. 6, 7. ' If the Plague can be kept
' from spreading by the means aforesaid (*viz.* by
strictly preventing all Intercourse of infected Places
with the Neighbourhood) ' it follows, that
' Infection is not received from the Air without,
' nor yet even with the Concurrence of something
' emitted:

Remark. ' The first of these Assertions does
' indeed appear, and is what *Dr. Mead* would
' prove: but how does the last appear? Does
' it follow, that because the Air will not commu-
' nicate the Plague to any one of it self; there-
' fore when it is impregnated with noxious Efflu-
' via emitted from Men diseased of the Plague,
' it shall not then be able to give the Distemper
' to others, by conveying into their Bodies those
' noxious Effluvia; and even by adding Force to
' them by means of some hurtful Qualities it may
' be possessed of, tho those Qualities alone would
' not produce the Distemper?

Note. This Writer does not take this Argument:
If Infection be received from the Air, tho it be
supposed necessary that the something emitted
should be mixed with it, Walls and Lines could
not keep it off, any more than if it was from the
Air without the mixture of any thing emitted.

Refuter, p. 7. ' But methinks he should have
' brought an Instance, if any such could have been
' found, where the Plague had actually been kept
' from spreading.

Remark. ' How little is this Writer acquainted
' with Books of Physick? for he need go no far-
' ther than the Works of *Dr. Sydenham* for such an
' Instance; where he will find, that the Grand
D Duke

Duke of *Tuscany* kept the Plague from spreading into his own Country, when it ran all over the rest of *Italy*, by this very Means*.

Note. What Dr. *Sydenham* here mentions, in all probability was only Hearsay: but suppose it Fact, it is no more than if it should be alledged, that the Kings of *Spain* and *Sardinia*, or the Magistrates of *Lyons* have now kept the Plague from spreading into their respective Territories: which would make nothing in the present case. For, as Dr. *Pye* says, an Instance should be brought, where the Place first infected in any Country having been enclosed with Lines, the Plague was there stopped, and did not spread any farther: but this from *Sydenham* is no such Instance. And I am apt to think none such can be produced.

Refuter, p. 8. Let it be supposed that the Plague had not reached the adjacent Villages, until some Persons had found means to escape; how does it thence appear, that it had been confined within and by those Walls?

Remark. It would from hence appear, that the Cause of it was not solely in the Air; because this was a considerable Time, and, as Dr. *Mead* argues, the least Wind must necessarily convey whatever noxious Quality resides in the Air alone, even to a great Distance.

Note. Let this Writer say how long it was: The Fallacy of this Remark may be farther seen from what Dr. *Pye* has said in his Discourse, Part II. page 13, 14, 15.

Refuter, p. 8. Plagues do not always spread themselves with the same Rapidity, but sometimes quicker, and sometimes more slowly.

* *Sydenham* Oper. p. 73.

Remark.

Remark. The Slowness with which Plagues usually spread themselves, is a great Argument that they are not caused by the Corruption of the Air alone; because any Disorder in the Air must of necessity at once discover it self over a great Extent of Country, and very soon extend a great deal farther.

Note. This likewise is obviated in the same Place of Dr. *Pye's* Discourse, by what is there said to take off an Objection of this kind.

Refuter, p. 9. It might have been expected, that a Fact whereon such a Notion was to be founded, and whereon so much depended, should have been supported and proved, &c.

Remark. This Author here talks, as if all Dr. *Mead's* Opinions relied wholly upon this Fact of *Marseilles*; which is no such thing. Dr. *Mead* does not, I suppose, set this down as the only, or the most certain Proof which could be given, but as it was the freshest. For indeed Dr. *Mead* has all along taken for granted, that the Plague is propagated by Contagion; it having been the constant Observation of all Mankind for a long time, that it is so: nor indeed will the contrary be proved, tho we should allow the Plague to be transported into the Villages adjacent to *Marseilles*, without being carried by Persons. For we might suppose, that when the Mortality in the City was very great, possibly the Air might be so deeply impregnated with the *Effluvia* constantly sent out from that Number of diseased Bodies, that a sufficient Quantity might be conveyed by the Winds to a Village near, so as to infect People in it; and if this had been so, the Infection would notwithstanding originally have been derived from the Bodies of the Sick. But till some such Fact as this is

clearly proved, it is unnecessary to make this Supposition.

Note. Dr. Mead did rely wholly upon this Fact, because he urged this and no other; and it is as manifest that this Fact on which he wholly relied has failed him. And if what this Writer here supposes be true, that the Pestilential Matter might be conveyed by the Winds out of *Marseilles* to a neighbouring Village; then Walls cannot keep the Plague from spreading, which disagrees with what Dr. Mead has laid down, that Walls may stop and confine it.

Refuter, p. 10. 'He (Dr. Mead) should have proved by undeniable Evidences.

Remark. 'This Refuter talks here as if the Debate were about some speculative Notions of little or no Importance, and does not consider that the Welfare of Mankind depends upon it. 'Suppose undeniable Evidences cannot be had, 'must we not act upon the most probable Suppositions, in a Case where a Neglect of any of these things he would dissuade us from, for want of Evidence, might be followed by the Destruction (nay, I had almost said Extirpation) of his native Country? But let us see the things he requires this Evidence for.

Note. According to this Writer, in trifling Speculations and of no Importance the strongest Evidence should be required; but in Cases of the utmost Importance, and when the making a wrong Judgment may have the most pernicious Consequences, we ought to act upon the weakest or no Evidence. This is running in the dark, which is certainly the way to tumble headlong. This Writer cannot shew in any one single Instance, that these Methods of Restraint, &c. which Dr. Pye would dissuade us from, have been in

in the least serviceable; on the contrary, they have always proved pernicious and destructive.

Refuter, p. 10, ' That not any one single Person had been sick of the Plague in any of the adjacent Villages, or without the Walls of *Marseilles*, till some Persons, finding means to escape, carried the Infection along with them.

Remark. ' It is sufficient to influence our Conduct, if it be probable.

Note. But all the Probability is on the other side.

Refuter, *ibid*. ' That some Persons, finding means to escape, did go to the adjacent Villages, or any of them, and were received into them.

Remark. ' This is not at all necessary; to an absolute Demonstration it would; but that is not here necessarily required. If the Plague goes not into those Villages before such Escape, it is a sufficient Proof that the Escapers carried it.

Note. But *Dr. Pye* has shewn there was no such Escape, before the Plague raged in the adjacent Villages.

Refuter, *ibid*. ' That the Persons escaping, and received into the adjacent Villages, were diseased Persons.

Remark. ' This is very trifling; for may not a Person escape with this Infection lodged in his Clothes, which may give it both to others and also to himself after his Escape? And besides, some who by their natural Constitution are not so susceptible of this Contagion as others, may yet carry away with them enough, in their Clothes, to infect others. Upon which ground it is, *Dr. Mead* advises, in an infected Ship, to burn the Clothes of the Sould as well as of the Sick, p. 22.

Note.

Note. Dr. Pye has shewn a little farther, that Infection cannot be conveyed in their Clothes; but it is plainly more the Design of this Remarker to overlook or misrepresent Arguments, than to endeavour to answer them.

Refuter, p. 10. ' And that the Plague was carried in like manner into all the Villages, Towns and Cities that were afterwards visited with it.

Remark. ' This is plainly ridiculous. In a probable Argument, as this is, is it not sufficient, that there is no Proof of the contrary in any one single Instance?

Note. It is plainly ridiculous to ask of this Writer or his Patron the probable Evidence of any thing they affirm; but most likely of this, because they have not the least Evidence to bring for it.

Refuter, *ibid.* ' Unless all and every of these Particulars can be clearly proved, what the Doctor (*viz. Mead*) has here said, must by no means be allowed to be Fact; but instead of that, overthrow his Argument and his Notion too.

Remark. ' This is very strange, they can afford no Argument, unless the contrary were proved; for if these Facts cannot be proved, yet they may chance to be true.

Note. This Writer would have an Assertion without Evidence received for Fact, if the Negative has not been proved, only because it may chance to be true. It may chance to be true that this Remarker asserts many things he knows to be false; and therefore, according to his own way of arguing, it certainly must be so, till he can prove the Negative.

Refuter,

Refuter, ibid. 'Why should not the Walls of Thoulon be as well able to keep the Plague out, as the Walls of Marseilles were to keep it in?

Remark. 'So, no doubt, they were.

Refuter, ibid. 'We have no Account, that any body escaping from Marseilles, either forced, or attempted to force their Way into Thoulon.

Remark. 'I think this is false; I have some Remembrance of such an Account. But suppose we had no Account of it, does that prove no body got into Thoulon, either from Marseilles, or some other Place infected? Might it not be done so privately, as not to be known? at least, is not this much more probable, than that the Air should preserve its Purity so long after the Air of Marseilles, to which it is but little distant, was corrupted?

Note. *I think this is false, is an undeniable Answer with this Writer.* It is not much more probable, nor probable at all, it should have been conveyed into Thoulon by Persons; for Dr. Pyr has given several good Reasons why the cause of the Sickness in the Air should not always be spread suddenly to the neighbouring Places. *Part 2. p.*

Refuter, p. 11. 'If the Persons escaping were not diseased, nothing can be thence inferred in favour of what the Doctor has affirmed.

Remark. 'This is already answered.

Note. According to this Writer's way of Answering.

Refuter, ibid. 'I answer, if the Atoms harbour'd in a Man's Clothes are not capable or sufficient to infect that Man, whose Body they touched, and that perhaps constantly, or for many Days together, it is highly improbable, if not utter-

ly impossible, that they should infect any other, much less many others.

Remark. I answer again, may not these Atoms be lodged in a Man's Clothes without touching his Body, tho his Clothes do? Besides, it is sufficient if one Person be infected by this means, for that Person will generate a new Stock of Matter of Infection.

Note. But they must yet be more likely to infect that Man, than any other; as will appear from the remaining part of the Argument. — In a short space of Time, and at a distance too. And if it be consider'd, that these, like other Atoms, may be forced off from any thing they adhere to, by the Air and by Heat, the foregoing Supposition must be still more absurd: for as these Atoms are supposed by the Propagators of this Notion, to be very volatile, they would soon fly off, in a manner, of themselves; or the Air, and its Motion, and the Wind would soon force them off. If to these be added the heat of the Body, augmented by the Exercise of hasty Flight and Travelling, and also the Heat and attractive Force of the Sun; it must needs be utterly impossible that any Atoms capable of flying, or of being forced off, should remain any time in the Clothes.

Refuter, p. 12. For as these Atoms are supposed, &c. to be very volatile, they would soon fly off, &c.

Remark. Are not Scents very volatile? and yet they will not soon fly out of Substances which imbibe them.

Note. Scents will soon fly off from any thing thus exposed to Air, Wind, Sun, &c.

Refuter, p. 12. It is not likely they (Escapers from *Marseilles*) should go to the adjacent Villages. Re-

Remark. ' Must they not have gone thro them ?

Note. I answer, No ; they might, and would purposely pass by them.

Refuter, p. 14. ' The first mention we had in our Publick Accounts of the Plague's being at *Mar-seilles*, was in an Article from *Paris*, dated *August 10th*, N. S.

Remark. ' The Journal of what passed in *Marseilles* published by Authority, shews the Plague to have appeared first about the End of *May*, and to be declared the Plague at the beginning of *July*.

Note. Dr. *Pye* argued from the *Gazette*, the best Authority he could then get.

Refuter, p. 14. ' In an Article from *Paris*, dated *August* the 21st N. S. I find the following Passage : ' *Tho the Contagion is entirely ceased at Marseilles, yet abundance of the meaner sort die there, and in that Neighbourhood.* From the manner of expressing this Passage, one might reasonably imagine, that the Plague had been some time in that Neighbourhood.

Remark. ' Is this reasonable ? In the first place this Account, in relation to *Marseilles*, was not true ; and what is said of the Neighbourhood, is no more than what they tell us happened before any Appearance of the Plague.

Note. But the Sickneſs which kill'd the People in the Neighbourhood of *Marseilles*, was the same as was afterwards called the Plague ; tho the People did not then own it to be the Plague.

Refuter, p. 15. ' From what has been said, it appears that the Sickneſs was in the Neighbourhood of *Marseilles* long before any Persons found means to escape, and indeed almost, if not quite as soon as it was at *Marseilles*.

Remark. * Hence we may judge of this Refuter's Reasoning; for first it is impossible to know how soon any might make their Escape out of *Marseilles*; nor, again, does it appear that the Plague was so very soon spread beyond the Territory of *Marseilles*, which had a Line drawn about it. It was the seventh of *October*, N. S. before it got to *Aix*, as is said in the *London Gazette* of *October* the fourth, 1720.

Note. If it be impossible to know how soon any Persons did make their Escape, *Dr. Mead* must have affirmed without Knowledge or Grounds, that the Plague was confined within the Walls of *Marseilles* till some Persons escaped. But it appears now by the Journal, that they never endeavoured to confine it within the Walls of *Marseilles* at all.

Refuter, p. 16. * He (*Dr. Mead*) says himself, " But when in an evil Disposition of this (the Air) they (Atoms emitted from diseased Persons) meet with the subtile Parts, its Corruption has generated by uniting with them, they become much more active and powerful, and likewise more durable and lasting, so as to form an infectious Matter capable of conveying the Mischief to a great Distance from the diseased Body, out of which it was produced " * If this be the Case, then it is impossible that either Walls or Lines can stop the Plague.

Remark. * This does not follow. Has *Dr. Mead* told us, that the Expression *great Distances* signifies several Miles? To understand him right, take the whole Sentence, Page 12. " These (*viz.* active Particles thrown off from sick Persons) in Pestilential Cases, altho the Air be in a right State, will generally infect those, who are very near to the sick Person; otherwise are soon dispersed and lost. But when in an evil Disposition

"tion of this, &c." Now the former part of this Sentence sufficiently explains the latter, cited by the Refuter, that when the Air is in a State which favours Contagion, not only those who are about the Sick, will receive infection, but some at a greater distance, so as to cause the Plague to spread by degrees over a whole Town, and even to elude a Wall, by which a Street may be blocked up; and this will be infecting at a great distance, in comparison of what it will do at other times. But it does not follow from thence, that Dr. Mead thought the Infection might be extended a Mile or two from any diseased Body; and if this is not, it may be shut in by a Line. This Author seems every where purposely to join Lines and the walling up of Streets together, to hide the better the Weakness of his Arguments: but they differ much; Lines Dr. Mead approves of, walling up Streets he must dislike, as being little different from shutting up Houses.

Note. Here is a long Remark, but I cannot see to what purpose; for Dr. Mead in this Place says, The Mischief may be conveyed in and by the Air. If it be conveyed by the Air, the infectious Matter must be in the Air: And Dr. Mead says, p. 14. The least Wind must necessarily convey whatever noxious Quality shall be in the Air, to a great distance, so as that Walls or Lines could not stop or prevent it. Dr. Pye says the very same thing.

Refuter, p. 18. Thus the Doctor has shewed a great many ways by which the Air may be rendered noxious, and occasion infectious Diseases, without the Concurrence of something emitted from diseased Persons.

Remark. Dr. Mead has shewn no such Thing, nor intended it, of these Northern Countries: He only shews what Constitution of Air in all

‘ Countries promotes the Disease; and the Causes
 ‘ which first breed it, he declares only to produce
 ‘ that Effect in the hot Countries; for no more than
 ‘ this is proved by the Authorities he quotes. And
 ‘ Dr. Mead’s Design is to shew how the Plague is
 ‘ bred originally in those hot Countries, and how
 ‘ it is transported from them to us.

Note. Dr. Mead has shewn what Dr. Pye says he
 has, without making any difference as to Northern
 or Southern Countries. This will be seen by any
 one, who shall read the 2d and 3d Pages of his
 Discourse.

Refuter, §. 2. p. 19. ‘ Any body would think, in
 ‘ reading his (Dr. Mead’s) Discourse, that when
 ‘ he says, Contagion is propagated by three Cau-
 ‘ ses, &c. he intended to assign three distinct Cau-
 ‘ ses, &c.

Remark. ‘ No doubt he did.

Refuter, p. 20. ‘ And yet there are some Passa-
 ‘ ges of his Discourse, which are utterly incon-
 ‘ sistent with this Meaning; for besides what has
 ‘ been taken notice of already, on another Oc-
 ‘ casion he says, a corrupted State of Air is with-
 ‘ out doubt necessary to give these contagious A-
 ‘ toms their full Force. — Consequently disea-
 ‘ sed Persons, or Atoms emitted from them, can-
 ‘ not possibly of themselves be the Cause, or one
 ‘ distinct Cause of the Pestilence.

Remark. ‘ Each of these, no doubt, is a distinct
 ‘ Cause; must it therefore follow, that they can
 ‘ separately produce their Effect? certainly the
 ‘ Word *distinct* signifies no such Thing. Dr. Mead
 ‘ has shewn what Causes are concerned in spread-
 ‘ ing among us the Pestilence, and treats of them
 ‘ distinctly one after another in Order, and assigns
 ‘ to each the proper Degree of its Effect. Goods
 ‘ import the Contagion first, infected Persons af-
 ‘ terwards

terwards spread it, being assisted herein by the
 ill Qualities of the Air, and likewise by Goods.

Note. This Remark furnishes another Specimen,
 either of this Writer's Understanding or Assu-
 rance; for here he supposes distinct Causes, that
 are distinctly capable of no Effects.

Refuter, p. 20. 'The Doctor is no less inconsis-
 tent and contradictory; for it is said, that it
 (infectious Matter) 'may be conveyed to a great
 Distance; and yet, in another Place he expressly
 asserts the contrary; his Words are, that the Air
 cannot spread these (Atoms emitted) to any
 great Distance, if Intercourse and Commerce
 with the Place infected be strictly prevented.

Remark. This is very impertinent. Is the
 Word *great* of so limited a Signification, that it
 must always signify the same Number of Feet or
 Paces? Is not the Sense of it very various, ac-
 cording to the various Occasions upon which it
 is used? In the first place, the Doctor used *great*
Distance in respect to a Room, in the other in res-
 pect to a Town, or City.

Note. Let the Reader judge in what sense *great*
Distance could be intended, upon comparing the
 two Passages together.

Refuter, p. 21. 'The second Part of this Dis-
 course proceeds upon a Supposition, that the
 Plague may be kept off, and be stopped by Lines,
 &c. which cannot be done, if the Cause be dif-
 fused in or by the Air; therefore, according to
 this Scheme, it can only be caused and propa-
 gated from one Person to another immediately,
 without the Concurrence and Help of the Air.

Remark. 'This Scheme only supposes, that the
 Cause of the Plague is not diffused by the Air to
 a very great Distance from the Sick.

Note.

Note. But if the Cause be in the Air, Dr. Mead has said himself, that the least Wind will convey it to a great distance, so that Walls or Lines cannot stop it, or prevent its Spreading.

Refuter, p. 21, 22. ' Because none (if the Cause of the Plague be not diffused in or by the Air) then could be infected, but such as had been near to some diseased Person; whereas many Instances may be had from *France*, as well as from Authors, of People's having been infected, tho they had not been near any diseased Person.

Remark. ' This, it seems, is designed for an Argument that the Cause of the Plague is so widely diffused by the Air, that Lines cannot keep it in; but it does not so much as prove, that the infectious *Effluvia* can be carried by the Air three Yards from a sick Person; for sound Persons may be infected by Clothes, or other Goods, which have been near the Sick.

Note. But it cannot be by means of Clothes or Goods when there is no Communication at all; and yet the Accounts from *France* inform us, that the Plague broke out in some Towns which had never had any Communication or Correspondence with any Place infected, so much as by Letters.

Refuter, p. 22. ' The Plague is very sudden and rapid in its Progress. — The Plague was spread throughout the whole Town of *Marseilles*, and from thence into the Villages adjacent in six or seven Days time at most.

Remark. ' This is utterly false; it appears by the Journal before cited, that it was above a Month in the Islands where the Quarantine of the Goods, which brought it, was perform'd, before it entered the Town at all; and moreover contradicts what was quoted from the Publick News in Page 14, tho this Writer is so inconsiderate

' siderate as to refer thereto upon this Occasion ;
 ' for *August 10th*, the Plague was said to have been
 ' in one Quarter of the Town only ; and, as far
 ' as appears by these Accounts, in *August 1st*, it
 ' was so far from having spread over the whole
 ' Town, that it was thought to have ceased entirely.
 ' Besides, the Journal before cited shews the Plague
 ' to have been owned a full Month (*viz.* from *July*
 ' *8th*) before this *10th* of *August*. Moreover,
 ' it is not said in the forementioned *Journal*, that
 ' the Plague had spread into every part of the
 ' Town before the *18th* of *August*, twelve Weeks
 ' from the Time the first Person died of the Plague,
 ' on board Captain *Chataud's* Ship. This is one
 ' Instance, among many others, how rashly this
 ' Writer reasons.

Note. The *Journal* this Writer refers to, was not
 printed till some time after *Dr. Pye's* Discourse was
 published ; the *Gazette* was his Authority, and
 from thence his reasoning was perfectly just. As
 to this *Journal*, in my Opinion *Dr. Mead's* No-
 tions may be thoroughly confuted by it.

Refuter, p. 23. ' If shutting up Houses cannot
 ' stop the Plague, &c. then for certain the Walls
 ' of Towns, or Lines, or Trenches cannot be
 ' conceived capable of doing it.

Remark. ' Why not ? because the Infection may
 ' be conveyed by the Air from one House to ano-
 ' ther contiguous to it, does that shew the Air
 ' can carry it a Mile or two ?

Note. Yes, *Dr. Mead* says it may, if it ever be in
 Air ; and it cannot possibly pass from House to
 House without being moved in and by the Air.

Refuter, p. 26. ' It follows, that the Infection is
 ' not communicated from sick Persons at all.

Remark. ' This follows, it seems, from the Re-
 ' futer's having argued thro the two preceding
 ' Pages

‘ Pages what Dr. *Mead* never denied, but has
 ‘ shewn by the very Arguments this Writer has
 ‘ thought fit to repeat after him, viz. that the
 ‘ Plague cannot spread far from sick Persons with-
 ‘ out the Concurrence of the Air. But how does
 ‘ this Refuter’s Consequence follow from hence ?
 ‘ Must diseased Persons have no hand in this, be-
 ‘ cause they cannot do it alone ? Cannot this Wri-
 ‘ ter conceive how two Causes, neither of them-
 ‘ selves sufficient, may by uniting produce an Ef-
 ‘ fect ?

Note. The Reader should turn to, and read the
 whole Argument this Scrap is taken from *. It
 proves, that tho the Cause of the Plague should
 come from sick Persons, it must yet be mixed with
 the Air ; and Dr. *Mead* says, If it be in the Air,
 Walls or Lines cannot stop it ; and therefore must
 be useless, or rather mischievous.

Refuter, §. 3. p. 27. ‘ It is not conceivable it
 (conveying the Plague from one Country to ano-
 ther) ‘ can be done by Land ; because Persons sick
 ‘ of the Plague can neither have Disposition nor
 ‘ Ability to travel by Land.

Remark. ‘ This Blunder I have already obviated.

Note. Where has he obviated this Argument ?
 But this Writer seems to depend on the shortness
 of his Readers Memories, and supposes they will
 not look back.

Refuter, p. 27. ‘ And tho the Sick may travel
 ‘ with more Ease by Sea, yet, &c.

Remark. ‘ This Argument is like the other. May
 ‘ not those of the Ship, who escape the Infection,
 ‘ escape it by their particular Disposition to resist
 ‘ the Contagion ; and yet may they not carry the

* Dr. *Pye*’s *Discourse*, p. 24, 25.

‘ Infection in their Clothes to others, who enjoy
‘ not such a Disposition ?

Note. Dr. *Pye* has shewn in his Discourse, p. 11, 12. and likewise in this Place, that the Infection cannot be carried in their Clothes : But this Writer is resolved to see nothing that makes against him.

Refuter, p. 28. ‘ But in case any of the Ship’s
‘ Crew should be seized before its Departure from
‘ the Place infected ; yet after its Departure, even
‘ according to what the Doctor says, the Sickness
‘ can go no farther, unless we suppose the same corrupted State of Air to be continued all the way.

Remark. ‘ This is not according to what Dr.
‘ *Mead* says, but the contrary. Dr. *Mead* does not
‘ say, a corrupted State of Air is necessary for
‘ these infectious Particles to act at all, but only to
‘ give them full Force, so as to spread the Sickness
‘ over a whole Town or Country ; for on the contrary he says, they may infect such as are near the
‘ Sick, tho the Air be in a right State, and all in
‘ a Ship are very near together.

Note. A corrupted state of Air must either be supposed to spread the Infection to a great distance, and then it cannot be stopped by Walls or Lines ; or it must be necessary to give the Atoms their full force to infect others standing near ; which is plainly Dr. *Mead*’s Sense : And then this Argument of Dr. *Pye*’s is just and conclusive.

Refuter, p. 29. ‘ It (the Plague) cannot be
‘ communicated in a Country where the Climate
‘ or Qualities of the Air are different from those,
‘ by the Concurrence of which the Plague had
‘ been produced.

Remark. ‘ How does this appear universally ?
‘ If this Author means Qualities quite different,
‘ the Plague will not be spread ; if he means only
‘ different, in Degree, it may.

Note. Dr. Mead supposes, when there is an amendment of the qualities of the Air, the Plague must cease; therefore if a great degree of Heat be necessary, whenever the Heat is abated that quality of Air is certainly amended, and consequently the Plague cannot be communicated where this Quality is different only in degree.

Refuter, p. 30, 31. ' Now besides other bad Qualities of the Air, it has been generally observed, there goes before, or accompanies the Plague in those Countries, great and continued Heat, or Heat and Moisture together; such Heat, for instance, as the Nature of our Climate cannot admit of.

Remark. ' Not indeed in so great a Degree; but does it appear that these ill Qualities are required in as great a Degree, to promote Infection, as to breed the Plague at first? This is nothing likely: Therefore our Air may sometimes possess the ill Qualities requisite in a Degree sufficient to promote this Contagion, when imported. Dr. Mead allows our Air not to be corrupted so eminently as that of *Africa*, and therefore the Plague never originally is bred in these Parts.

Note. Such a Degree as is necessary to the continuance of the Plague in any Country, must be necessary to its Communication elsewhere.

Refuter, p. 32. ' If the Plague had spread itself through *China*, the *East-Indies*, *Syria*, *Turkey*, *Aegypt*, *Greece*, *Africa*—Now as these Countries are vastly distant and remote, it is absurd to imagine the Plague could be spread thro so great a Part of the World in so short a Space of Time, not by means of the Air, but by a Communication from Person to Person only.

Remark.

Remark. ' Do not every one of these Countries border upon some one of the rest ?

Refuter, p. 32. ' And as there is not a continual current Commerce between them.

Remark. ' Not between those most distant from each other ; but no doubt there was enough for this Purpose between those that were next contiguous.

Note. Dr. *Pye*'s Argument intire is as follows-- ' It is monstrously absurd to imagine that the Plague could be spread thro so great a Part of the World in so short a space of time, not by means of the Air, but by a communication from Person to Person only. The Absurdity of this Supposition appears to me so glaring, that I have thought, after having made the foregoing Remark, I might excuse my self the trouble of looking into the History of that Plague, to seek for other Circumstances, wherewithal to expose the Folly of any Inference that may be made from the Instance above, in favour of the Notion, that Infection is propagated throughout the World by means of sick Persons, and not from the Air.

No doubt this Writer will say any thing he thinks will serve his turn.

Refuter, p. 35. ' Here we see it is declared contrary to what Dr. *Mead* says, that this Disease (*viz.* Sweating Sicknefs) was not foreign.

Remark. ' This indeed seems to be Dr. *Keyes*'s Opinion, tho he does not expressly, in the Passage here quoted, say that ; yet since he informs us some were of another Mind, why may not likewise Dr. *Mead*? Is *Keyes*'s Opinion an undeniable Proof?

Note. Dr. *Keyes* no where informs us of any one who was of another Mind. The Evi-

dence he has given us appears unanswerable.

Refuter, p. 36. ' It does not follow, that it ever entered into their Thoughts that it was brought from the Siege of *Rhodes*.

Remark. ' Perhaps the Passage quoted by this Writer from *Dr. Keyes* does not strictly prove what *Dr. Mead* says; but there is another Passage in that Author, which does prove it. In p. 53, 54. *Nov. Edit.* there are these Words; "*Sed demus Trojano, Cantabrico aut Rhodiensi bello (uti suspicantur quidam) non Britannico solo morbum hunc natum esse.* Grant this Disease to have taken its Birth at the *Trojan, Cantabrian, or Rhodian War* (as some suspect) and not in the *British Soil*." ' Now is it not evident, that they who supposed the Disease not to have had its Birth here, must of necessity suppose it transported from some Place of its Birth, and certainly from *Rhodes*, where it was no longer than four Years before?

Note. *Dr. Pye* says, ' And as to its having been at *Rhodes*, it may be observed, that *Dr. Keyes* is speaking of the Genus or the Kind of the Disease, when he says, that some Persons conjectured, it had raged at three several Places before it appeared in *England*. But because it had been supposed by some Persons, that the Disease which raged among the *Greeks* before *Troy*, amongst the *Cantabrians* in *Spain*, or amongst the *Turks* at *Rhodes*, was of the same nature or kind with our sweating Sickness; it does not follow, that it ever enter'd into their Thoughts, that it was brought from the Siege of *Rhodes* (which happened five Years before) to *France*, and from *France* to us in *England*. Neither can there be any more Reason for supposing, from what *Dr.*

' *Keyes*

' *Keyes* has said, that any Persons had ever thought,
 ' it was brought to us from *Rhodes*, than that
 ' they had likewise thought it had been carried
 ' from *Spain* to *Rhodes*, or from *Troy* to *Spain*.
 ' Besides, that it was never brought to or from
 ' *France*, is evident, because this Plague never
 ' raged in *France*, neither could the *French* People
 ' ever be infected with it any where else.

It is so far from strictly proving what *Dr. Mead*
 says, that it proves the direct contrary; the Pas-
 sage here quoted will serve the turn no better, for
 it plainly refers to what had been said before, and
 regards the *Genus* or Kind of the Disease. And
 those who supposed it, not to have its Birth or first
 Appearance here, did no more suppose it transport-
 ed hither from *Rhodes*, than they did that it was
 transported to *Spain* from the Siege of *Troy*, which
 happen'd several thousand years before. It was full
 five Years from the Siege of *Rhodes* to the time it
 broke out here; and I would be glad to know
 where it had its Residence during that time.

Refuter, §. 4. p. 36. ' He (*Dr. Mead*) has no
 ' where clearly or expressly declared, what it is
 ' that Goods receive and convey, whether it be
 ' the Poison supposed by him to be generated in
 ' the *Eastern* and *Southern* Parts, or whether it be
 ' something emitted.

Remark. ' It is no matter which, for both will
 ' have the same Effect.

Note. *Dr. Pye's* Words immediately following
 this Quotation are——' However, be it which
 ' or what it will, the following Arguments will
 ' evince that the Plague cannot be conveyed
 ' in Goods from one Country to another.

Refuter, p. 37. ' As our Trade with *Turkey* has
 ' very much encreased since the Year 1665, we
 ' ought

ought to have had more frequent Returns of the Plague since that Time, than before.

Remark. ' This does not follow; for the Absence of the requisite ill State of Air is sufficient to prevent that.

Note. This Writer has said a little before that the Plague will be communicated unless the Qualities of Air are quite different or opposite to those wherein it was produced; and have the Qualities of Air been quite different or opposite to those in *Turkey*, for 56 Years together? If so, I see no reason why we should now think our selves in any danger from those Parts.

Refuter, p. 37. ' If Goods are so susceptible and retentive of Infection, as the Notion supposes, then such Persons as first unpack and open Goods brought from infected Places, would very often have been infected thereby.

Remark. ' Dr. *Mead* does not say how susceptible they are, but only that they are so susceptible as sometimes to occasion the Mischief. And if this be but seldom, yet the Consequence is so fatal, that we ought always to guard against it.

Note. That they are so susceptible as sometimes to occasion the Mischief, should have been shewn by Instances; because even this is denied.

Refuter, *ibid.* ' If it be admitted, that Infection is conveyed into them (Goods) by means of the Air, then Walls, Lines, and Quarantanes must be useless.

Remark. ' This at most will only shew these Things useless in the Places where the Goods receive their Infection, and not where they are afterwards brought.

Note.

Note. But if the Cause of the Pestilence be in the Air in *Turkey*, Why may it not be supposed that the Cause of it here too is in the Air?

Refuter, p. 38. 'The *Europeans* sometimes have not been infected in *Turkey*, when the Plague has raged there among the Natives.

Remark. 'Because they either remove out of the Way of it, or shut themselves up; but at *Smyrna* the *French* Merchants, who use not that Caution, do seldom escape it.

Note. At *Smyrna* the *Europeans* do sometimes shut up, if the Pestilence happens there, at a time when there is no business going forward; but at *Constantinople* they never do, and yet are not subject to the Sickneses which rage among the Natives. As to what this Writer affirms in relation to the *French*, I am informed, it is utterly false; for the Merchants tell me there is not an Instance, that a *Frenchman* has died there of the Plague. Moreover, this Writer has allowed, in the last Remark, that in *Turkey* the Cause of the Plague may be in the Air, so that Walls or Lines are useless there; and in another Remark, that the Air of those Countries breeds the Plague. Therefore, according to what he himself admits, shutting up, or not shutting up in *Turkey*, can make no difference; which was likewise the Case at *Marseilles*, for in the *Journal* before mentioned it is said; 'And what is most surprising, those that were the closest shut up in their Houses, and the most careful not to receive any thing, but with the most exact Precautions, were attacked by the Sicknes, and it slipped in one knows not how.' This shews that the Notion of catching the Disease from the Sick or from the Dead, is a vulgar Error, founded in Terror and Ignorance, and which has continued to prevail to the destruction of

of Mankind, only for want of being rightly enquired into.

Refuter, *ibid.* ' Nay, *Dr. Mead* says himself, ' that all Plagues do not indifferently affect all ' Kinds of living Creatures. Whence it may be ' inferred, that the Cause of the Plague is not one ' and the same Thing, &c.

Remark. ' This only shews, that the Plague ' Men are subject to, and that which affects other ' Animals, is not the same.

Note. The Words going before are— ' No ' Foreigners whatever were seized with our ' Sweating Sicknes, and the *German Sweating* ' Sicknes did not hurt the *English*.'

What this Writer has quoted, and what he has thought fit to leave out, do together shew what *Dr. Pye* infers.

Refuter, p. 39. ' Plagues happening at different ' Times, tho in the same Country, have been ' observed to vary very much in their Symp- ' toms.

Remark. ' Not more than the different Kinds ' of Small Pox differ; excepting only the Sweat- ' ing Sicknes, in which *Dr. Mead* supposes the ' Nature of the Contagion to be altered by the ' Quality of the Air it met with.

Note. What can this Remarker say to the Plague of *Athens*, described by *Thucydides*? To the Convulsive Pestilence in the Years 1596 and 1597, described by *Sennertus*? or to the Sweating Sicknes? Besides many others which might be named: Will he say these were no more different than different kinds of Small Pox?

Refuter, *ibid.* ' The Sweating Sicknes here in ' *England* was as different from the last Plague ' we had in 1665, as any two Distempers can well ' be.

Remark.

Remark. Perhaps not quite so different; for they were both more mortal than any other Distempers ever are. But even suppose the Sweating Sickneſs had not the ſame Original as the Plague, it only follows, that Quarantanes may not therefore keep out the Sweating Sickneſs, nor that they will not keep out the common Plague.

Note. Quarantanes will keep out one Peſtilence as well as another.

Refuter, p. 39. 'If the Cauſe of the Diſeaſe was a ſpecifick Poiſon, &c. the ſame Methods would at all times be found uſeful.

Remark. This is no Conſequence, any more than that the ſame Methods ſhould always be uſeful in the Small-Pox; both Diſtempers muſt be treated differently, when they are in a leſs degree, from what they muſt be when in a greater.

Note. The ſame Method, in the main, is uſeful in every kind of Small-Pox: But there is no Method, nor even any one ſmall Medicine, that is ſerviceable in every Peſtilence; but on the contrary, that which is uſeful in one, is found hurtful in another. Whence it follows, that the Small-Pox is always the ſame Diſeaſe; and likewise, that different Peſtilences are different Diſeaſes.

Refuter, *ibid.* 'The ſame bad Qualities of Air as are neceſſary to put the Seeds of Contagion into Action in their native Climate, muſt undoubtedly be neceſſary in any other Climate, which is not natural to them; but the ſame bad Qualities of Air are never likely to happen in England; and therefore, &c.

Remark. This is already answered; for the ſame bad Qualities do occur here, tho' in a leſs degree.

Note. Whence is it then we have had no Pestilence these 56 Years?

Refuter, p. 40. *Hodges, Bellini*, and others, have taken notice of certain Signs, that are wont to precede the breaking out of the Plague. We may judge from them of the evil Disposition and Tendency of the Air; but they cannot possibly be supposed to pre-signify, that a Ship is coming from *Turkey* with a Bale of infected Goods.

Remark. Here this Refuter seems to depart a little from his affected Gravity. But we shall answer with great Sobriety, that they show therefore only, that if Contagion should be imported by any means, the Plague will be like to follow; but these Signs are not infallible Marks of the Plague's certain coming.

Note. Authors speak of em as Signs absolutely, not conditional; and *Dr. Hodges* lays, p. 42. of *Quincy's* Translation, "So that subterraneous Animals, such as Moles, Mice, Serpents, Conies, Foxes, &c. as conscious of approaching Mischief, leave their Burrows, and lie open in the Air; which is also a certain Sign of a Pestilence at hand."

Refuter, p. 41. They write from thence (*viz. Smyrna*) they never enjoyed a better state of Health. Thus, it is seen, Plagues will not be carried from Place to Place.

Remark. This Page only shews the present Air of *Smyrna* not disposed to receive Contagion.

Note. Does it appear that the Air of *Smyrna* was different this Year from what it is other Years? and in what Respects was it different? This Writer here, as in most other Places, omits the chief part of the Argument, but it may be hoped the Reader will turn to it in *Dr. Pye's* Discourse.

Refuter, p. 42. The other is an Account from *Boccacio* of two Hogs, which died within an Hour after they had torn with their Teeth, &c. some Rags which came from a Man dead of the Sickneſs. It is very probable, theſe Hogs had before received the Diſeaſe, &c.

Remark. This is a very bold way of eluding an Argument. How is this probable, unleſs other Hogs had likewiſe been found to be infected?

Note. *Dr. Pyle's* Words are——— 'The other is an Account from *Boccacio* of two Hogs which died within an Hour after they had torn with their Teeth, &c. ſome Rags which came from a Man dead of the Sickneſs. I have not looked into that Author, becauſe this Fact, as it is here related, can be of no Service to the Doctor; for ſince ſome Plagues do affect the Brute Kind, as well as Men, it is very probable theſe Hogs had before received the Diſeaſe from the Air, and by their ſnuffing and tearing the Rags in the manner here repreſented, it ſhould ſeem that they were in Conviſions at the time they did it. But if this were not the Caſe, ſince it may be ſuppoſed that theſe Rags had been uſed about ſome Plague Sores, all that can be inferred from it, is, that if the Matter of the Diſeaſe be taken into the Mouth and chewed, it will produce the Sickneſs. This I don't deny, no more than that the Small-Pox may be produced by Inoculation. But hence it does not follow that Infection is tranſmitted to Perſons ſtanding near the Sick, or received by touching and aſſiſting them.

It did not ſuit his Purpoſe to give this Quotation fairly:

Refuter, §. 5. p. 44. Now if it be likely, that in Winter the Contagion may not be taken out of Goods, &c. then Quarantanes in Winter will

be a very precarious and uncertain Means, if they are not altogether useless.

Remark. 'What does this prove? that Quarantanes in Winter are not to be enjoined? Does it not rather prove, that no Goods should be dismissed out of Quarantine during the Winter? But what if this Warmth of Summer may be supplied at the easy Rate of making Fires in the *Lazaretto's*?

Note. If the Infection be forced out with Fires, it must still be forced into the Air; and then Dr. Mead says it must necessarily be conveyed a great way quickly.

Refuter, p. 44. 'If the Persons, who first unpack the Goods coming from infected Places in the *Lazaretto's* abroad, are never injured thereby; and I cannot hear of any Instance that they ever have.

Remark. 'The *Journal* of what passed at *Marseilles* affords more than one undeniable Instance hereof.

Note. The Facts related in this *Journal*, seemed to me to make so clearly against the modern Notion of Contagion; that if this Writer had not mentioned them as undeniable Instances in his Favour, I should not have thought there had been any Persons here in *England* so dull of Understanding, or so much blinded with Prejudice, as to stand in need of having those Facts put into a more obvious Light: but having this Occasion, I shall consider them more largely than otherwise I should have done, and shew that the Porters who died in the *Lazaretto* at *Marseilles*, received no Hurt or Infection from the Goods:

1. Because if any Infection, or infectious *Aura*, can be supposed to be packed up, and brought in Goods; such Infection, or infectious *Aura*, must neces-

necessarily issue forth from them in greatest Abundance, and with greatest Force, at the first unpacking or opening of them; And as it must continue to fly off every Moment, and be thereby continually diminishing, it is likewise certain that in a very few Days the Goods must be in great measure, if not entirely, cleared of it. Wherefore if the Porters could have been infected from the Goods at all, it must have been at the first opening them: But even according to this *Journal*, the Porters that first fell sick, were not taken ill before the 23^d of *June*; whereas Captain *Chataud's* Ship arrived the 25th of *May* preceding; so that the Goods of that Ship, in purifying which the Porter first mentioned was employed, had been airing and purifying for 26 or 28 Days before this Accident happened; and it cannot be conceived, that after so long time they should not have been entirely purged of all Infection or infectious *Aura*, if any could have been brought with them. Or if it can be supposed, which I think impossible, that any part of it might still be left, it must withal be supposed so much less than at first, as not to be capable of doing those Porters especially, the least Hurt: To suppose otherwise, would be to argue that the same Man, who some Days before had received and born a very great Quantity and Force without any Injury, could then be killed by a Quantity and Force, as one may say, infinitely less. For tho it may be conceived, that a Person, who being not accustomed to *Laudanum*, therefore cannot at first bear fifty Drops of it, may by beginning with ten, and encreasing the Dose a Drop or two every Day, be brought to take fifty at once without the least Disorder following; yet it cannot possibly be imagined that one whole Constitution could bear fifty Drops

Drops at first, should afterwards be killed by a single Drop only.

To leave no room for Objection, I shall take notice that a Guard of Quarantine died on board eleven Days before; but as this Officer was no way concern'd either in unloading or opening the Goods, he could receive no hurt from them; and besides, this must have been 14 or 15 Days after the Goods had been carried out of the Ship into the *Lazaretto*. Farther, six of their Men are said to die at *Leghorn*; but the Town of *Leghorn* was not infected from hence; which would have been more likely, if there had been any Infection in the Case, than that *Marseilles* should afterwards be infected. Neither were these Men employed in opening or unloading the Goods; nor could their Deaths be owing to any Infection they might have received in *Syria*, for that their Ship had been come away from those Parts above three Months; and the Physicians of the *Prattick* at *Leghorn* declared, that they died of malignant Fevers caused by the bad and unwholesome Provision they were forced to live upon.

2. Because this Ship did not come from an infected Place; for it parted from *Syria* the 3rd of *January*: Whereas the Plague did not break out in those Parts till the latter end of *March*, near two Months after; there being therefore no Infection, nor infectious *Aura*, in those Places, neither Men, Ship, nor Goods could receive or bring any with them.

It may be said notwithstanding that Captain *Gabriel's* Ship came away from those Parts after the Pestilence was begun; and that one of the Porters employed in purifying his Goods, fell sick about 11 or 12 Days after he arrived. But,

1. According to the Report of Merchants, *Frenchmen* are not subject to the Plague in *Turkey*; and

and it cannot be conceived, that so small a quantity of infectious Air as can be packed up, and brought in a Bale of Goods, should destroy them in France, or in an Air and Climate distant and different; when the whole Atmosphere of the same infectious Air is found not to injure them in the very infected Places, and wherein it is allowed to be bred or generated.

2. If the Porter last mentioned could have been infected this Way, it must have been at the first opening the Goods, as has been more largely shewn before, and not after they had gone through 8 or 9 Days airing and purifying.

3. The Persons employed on Captain Chataud's Ship and Goods, as likewise this Porter, died all of the same Sickness, which therefore must be supposed to have the same Cause; but it has been fully manifested, that the Sickness in the former, was not owing to any Turkey Infection from the Goods, or otherwise.

4. It appears by this *Journal* that the Plague at *Marseilles* did not come this way, i. e. not by Commerce; for the Goods that came by these Ships were kept in an Island off at Sea, with which all Intercourse and Communication was entirely cut off; neither were they ever brought into the Town; nor were the Passengers permitted to enter, till they had undergone a strict Purification. The Porters that fell sick in the Lazaretto on that Island, were kept there, died there, and were buried there; Whence it is evident, that the Plague was not communicated to the Town of *Marseilles* from those Ships or Goods; but must have had its Rise from some other Cause.

5. The Pestilence was begun in the Town of *Marseilles* before the Porters died in the Lazaretto: For the *Journal* informs us, that the very next day

day after the Surgeons had declared it to be the Plague in the Lazaretto, some Persons were found and declared to have the Plague in the Town too; and that it was not so declared sooner, seems to have been for this Reason only, because the Surgeons did not find those Marks which they (as have likewise some amongst us) had ignorantly fancied the necessary Concomitants of a Pestilence. Moreover a Person now in Town, who resided at *Marseilles* all the preceding Spring and Winter, and till the latter end of *July* following, does assure me that the People had died there in such Numbers, and withal so suddenly and unaccountably, for two Months before the first of these Ships arrived, that the Town was much alarmed about it: he farther declares that the Sickness which raged before, was to all appearance the same as proved so pestilential or destructive afterwards. And I am credibly informed, that Dr. *Mead* himself has received a Letter from the Regent's Physician, which acquaints him that the Plague had been in the Town of *Marseilles* some time before any of these Ships were come.

Whoever shall read over the Narrative aforementioned with due care and attention, will find many other Facts in it strongly impugning the modern Notion of Contagion, but not one that can make any thing in favour of it. And this Narrative will farther display to them such a View of the Effects of Barracks, Pesthouses, and Restraints, as will fill their Souls with the extremest Concern and Horror; so that if there were none other, this Instance alone is sufficient for ever to deter the Magistracy, in future Pestilences, from using any kind of Restraints whatever.

Refuter, p. 44. The enforcing Quarantanes will certainly and inevitably encrease the Running

ning of Goods; by which means we may be as much exposed to the Plague, &c. as if Quarantanes were not enjoined.

Remark. Not so much, unless all the Goods are run, so that none perform Quarantane. Besides, this only relates to one Case; for Quarantanes are ofteneft enjoined, in regard of Places from whence Goods are scarce ever run: Which is even the present Case; for the Plague is not at present in any of the Ports in France, to which the Owers trade.

Note. Since Quarantanes are ofteneft enjoined, as the Remarker observes, in regard of Places from whence Goods are scarce ever run; therefore we are in more danger of having the Plague brought amongst us, if Goods can bring it, by means of Quarantanes than without 'em; for if they be not enjoined, and the People are only obliged to air their Goods upon Deck, there will be no Temptation for People to run them more than there was before; but if Quarantanes be enjoined, the Advantage of getting their Goods on shore sooner will be so great, that People will be induced to attempt it: and then they will be brought in without any previous Airing.

Refuter, p. 45. Such Goods as are clandestinely run on shore, will probably be kept more close (that is, than Goods not run) and therefore be the more likely to retain the Infection.

Remark. Will hiding Goods in a Cellar or other obscure Place, cause them to retain Infection longer than shutting them up in a Warehouse? But what has the length of Time to do, in which Goods brought here may retain their infectious Qualities? If they retain them but long enough to infect one Person, they have

‘ done all the Mischief we need to fear from
‘ them.

Note. The Goods clandestinely imported will
be kept more close aboard; and be brought ashore
secretly without Airing, whence there will be more
Danger, if Dr. Mead's Principles are right.

Refuter, p. 45. §. 4. ‘ If Lazarettoes, &c.

Remark. This Article only shews, that Goods
‘ when first brought into a Lazaretto, should not
‘ be promiscuously mixed with those, which have
‘ before been airing; nor Persons at their first
‘ coming be permitted freely to converse with
‘ those, who have been there some Time.

Note. The Argument is omitted, but the Rea-
der should turn to it in Dr. Pye's Discourse.

Refuter, p. 46. ‘ If the Seeds of Contagion can
‘ be brought by Persons and Goods, then the
‘ making Lazaretto's must be erecting and establish-
‘ ing so many Storehouses or Seminaries of Con-
‘ tagion.

Remark. ‘ For this Reason Dr. Mead directs
‘ them to be built remote from any Habitations
‘ in small Islands. But besides, these Lazaretto's
‘ will not be so very replete with infectious
‘ Matter, as is here fancied, since the Goods
‘ brought into them are but seldom infected.

Note. The Argument referred to, if perused, will
obviate this Remark.

Refuter, p. 47. ‘ By the Motion of the Air,
‘ they (the Seeds of Contagion discharged from
‘ Goods in a Lazaretto) may be conveyed farther
‘ and farther, so as to spread the Infection not
‘ only all over the Lazaretto, but likewise to the
‘ adjacent Villages.

Remark. ‘ Dr. Mead has shewn, that these Seeds
‘ of Contagion are scarce ever spread so far.

Note.

Note. Where has Dr. Mead shewn any thing against this Argument? Neither the Reader nor this Remarker will ever be able to find it.

Refuter, p. 47. "And we find in fact they (Quarantanes) are not sufficient for keeping off the Plague.

Remark. "These Facts only shew them not to be infallible, but do not shew them to be never effectual. And all that follows in Page 48. is of the same kind. And that they are mostly effectual, appears, that by a careful Observance of Quarantanes, the *European* Coast of the *Mediterranean* is much seldomer infected than the *African* side. Besides, this is farther confirmed from hence, that the *Morea*, when in the hands of the *Venetians*, by these Means, is rarely visited with the Plague; but when in possession of the *Turks*, it does not escape Infection for three Years together: Which cannot arise from the Poverty of the Inhabitants, when they are subject to the *Turk*, exceeding what it is when they are under the *Venetian*; or any Fears and Consternations they are more subject to in the first Case, than in the latter: which are the only great Causes supposed by Dr. Pye to enforce a Pestilential State of Air; by reason it will be easily allowed, that no Government is harder upon their common Subjects, than that of *Venice*. See Dr. Pye's Second Part, p. 16, 17.

Note. It may be proper to put the Reader in mind once for all, that this Remarker has not in any of his Quotations given us Dr. Pye's Argument entire; but has always left out those parts which set the Matter in the strongest light; so that the Reader should always turn to and read the Argument as it stands in Dr. Pye's Discourse. As to this Remark, Have not we been as seldom in-

fectcd without Quarantanes as other Countries that inforce them? And for what this Writer says in relation to the *Morea*, should he not have mention'd his Authority? Should he not have said at least how many Years it was in the hands of the *Venetians*, and how many in those of the *Turks*, and how many times it had been visited with the Plague whilst in the possession of either? for nothing possibly can be inferr'd from this Account thus loosely related. And I the rather urge this, because I cannot learn from some Merchants I have talked with, that there is any foundation for this Story: but if there was, it can be nothing to the purpose; for there are no Places in *Turkey* where the Plague has its constant and regular Returns. Likewise the different manner of living, and some other Circumstances, might make a considerable difference; which may all be enlarged upon whenever this or any other Writer shall think fit to relate this Story more circumstantially.

Refuter, p. 49. ' As to burning of Ships or
' Goods, that can never be of any Service, &c.
' for whatever infectious Matter may reside in the
' Ships or Goods, the Heat of the Fire will neces-
' sarily throw it all at once into the Air, &c.

Remark. ' This only shews, that these Things
' should be burnt at a great Distance from any Ha-
' bitations; and perhaps that the Persons concern-
' ed in it should be obliged to a Quarantane af-
' terwards.

Note. In *Dr. Pye* it is said the Heat of the Fire will necessarily throw it all at once into the Air, and give it an additional force. This shews the Infection will be thrown into the Air; and if it be, *Dr. Mead* says it must necessarily be conveyed to a great distance.

Refuter, §. 6. p. 50. ' But let it be supposed,
' that Quarantanes could be enforced, so as to
' become

‘ become an effectual Means of Security; I am
 ‘ persuaded it might still be made appear, it
 ‘ would not be for the Interest of this Nation to
 ‘ enforce them.

Remark. ‘ I need say little of this whole Sec-
 ‘ tion; for I am persuaded the most interested Tra-
 ‘ der cannot think there is any thing in it. I shall
 ‘ only ask, whether any one in his right Mind
 ‘ can imagine, that from the Time of the last
 ‘ Plague to this very Hour, the Number of Fami-
 ‘ lies brought to Poverty merely by Quarantanes,
 ‘ if there have indeed been any such, is any way
 ‘ to be mentioned or compared with the Number
 ‘ destroyed in that one Year by the Plague, in the
 ‘ City of *London* only?

Note. I am persuaded any Man of understand-
 ing, not at all interested, who shall carefully con-
 sider that Section, will think as *Dr. Pye* does. The
 Question this Writer here asks would be somewhat
 to the purpose, if Quarantanes had been enforced
 ever since the last Plague: but since they have been
 enforced but a very little time, it can be look-
 ed upon only as an Evasion.

Refuter, §. 7. p. 55. ‘ The Doctor (*Dr. Mead*)
 ‘ supposes that the Winter Season does suppress it
 ‘ (the Plague;) but this could never be, if the
 ‘ Cause proceeded from sick Persons.

Remark. ‘ What does this prove? By the same
 ‘ Argument might be proved, that the *Tarantula*,
 ‘ the noted venomous Spider in some Parts of
 ‘ *Italy*, is not really venomous, because its Bite
 ‘ produces ill Effects only in the hot Season, and
 ‘ not in the Winter.

Note. Whenever the *Tarantula* is venomous, its
 Bite produces ill Effects; but in Winter it is not
 venomous. Its being or not being venomous
 therefore depends evidently upon the Heat of the
 Weather; likewise if the Pestilence be from the
 Con-

Constitution of the Air, the Winter Season may very often be supposed to suppress it; particularly when it depends on the heat of the Weather; but if the Pestilence be occasion'd by a real Poison, which is constantly breathed forth and emitted from diseased Persons, there can be no reason why it should not produce its Effects in Winter as well as in Summer, in like manner as other Poisons.

Refuter, p. 55. 'According to this Notion, every sick Person must emit vastly more of Pestilential Matter, than he had received.

Remark. 'What if he does? It is supposed, that the Juices of every sick Person's Body are, some Part of them, corrupted into this contagious Matter.

Note. If this Writer will explain what he means, by saying the Juices of the Body are corrupted into this contagious matter, as also by what Power and how it is performed, I shall know what to say to it; but at present it appears to me unintelligible as well as unphilosophical.

Refuter, p. 55. 'And the Quantity of Pestilential Matter emitted must be immensely great.

Remark. 'The impertinent Calculations which here follow, conclude no more against a sick Person being infectious, than they would do against a Rose having a Scent; for a Rose will have emitted Matter enough for as many Persons to have smelt, as here a sick Person is supposed capable of infecting. And was the Odour venomous and deadly, as is said of some Poisons, as many Persons would be killed by it.

Note. Do not these Calculations shew the Notion to be very absurd? Neither is the matter mended by what is here said with respect to a Rose; for if a Rose be supposed to emit poisonous Effluvia in such abundance, and these Roses were

were to be increased and multiply in like manner, the same immense quantity of poisonous Matter would be diffused in the Air.

Refuter, p. 56. ' If the Cause of the Disease was thus transmitted, &c. it is not easy to conceive how the Plague, when once it had seized any Place, should ever cease, but with the destruction of all the Inhabitants.

Remark. Dr. Mead shews how this is to be conceived, viz. by supposing the ill Qualities of the Air, whose Concurrence he proves necessary to spread the Disease, to be corrected, and the Air to be restored to a healthful State.

Note. Dr. Pye has proved in the Words immediately following, that this Answer of Dr. Mead's is not sufficient to take off the Objection.

Refuter, p. 57. ' The Doctor has not told us, what he means precisely by a corrupted State of Air; which, methinks, he should have done.

Remark. ' Methinks he needed not. The Case is thus: Persons diseased of the Plague have been observed to infect others; and that the Plague, when it enters any Place, by this means spreads from House to House, and from Street to Street; notwithstanding which, the Plague afterwards shall abate and go off, as if its infectious Quality were gone. This Dr. Mead observes to prove, that some ill Quality of the Air is required to act in conjunction with the infectious Effluvia, to make them fully contagious; but this does not shew what that ill Quality precisely is; and therefore Dr. Mead was not obliged to say any thing about it.

Note. If what Dr. Pye has said farther upon this Point, be perused, the Reader will find there was not the least room for this Remark.

Refuter

Refuter, p. 58. ' And all Sicknesses, which are
' general and deadly, are, properly speaking,
' Plagues.

Remark. ' They are not always, properly speak-
' ing, Plagues. But this Author has shewn him-
' self, throughout this Discourse, very ignorant of
' what Physicians have writ of this Disease ; and if
' he has read at all, has certainly read without a-
' ny manner of Judgment.

Note. This Writer would have done well to have told us, for what reason such Sicknesses as are general and deadly, are not Plagues ; or what, properly speaking, a Plague of Pestilence is ; and therefore he should have given his Definition of a Pestilence. Why has he not shewn what he endeavours to insinuate, that Dr. *Pye* is ignorant of what Physicians have writ of this Disease ? Or is it for this Reason only, because he [Dr. *Pye*] does not agree with some modern Physicians in their inconsistent Notions ; but rather chuses to adhere to the Opinion of the Antients, as to the Cause of Pestilences ?

Refuter, *ibid*. ' How does it appear, that these
' Atoms emitted from sick Persons have any Share
' or Concern in the Affair ? This the Doctor should
' have shewn.

Remark. ' It was needless ; it having been already established by the Observation of Men in almost all Times and Places.

Note. In this Remark he tells us, The Notion of infectious Atoms has been established by the Observation of Men in almost all Times and Places ; so have many other idle Notions, such as Dreams, Omens, Witchcraft, &c. This Writer would do well to tell us how many Physicians have left such Observations behind them, who lived before the 15th Century : I am sure the greatest and most antient Physicians,

sicians, and who lived in the Countries where Plagues are frequent, made no such Observations.

Refuter, p. 61. ' If, for Example, it should be
' said, that the Touch of a seventh Son will cure
' the Rheumatism, or any other Ailment; it would
' be thought enough to answer, that several Per-
' sons having tried it, had found no Benefit there-
' by.

Remark. ' This is not enough; the conclusive
' Argument against this, or any such Conceit,
' must be, that much the greatest Part of those
' who have tried, have found no Benefit.

Note. If this Writer does not know how many Persons have tried the Touch of a Seventh Son, he cannot say, that the greatest part of 'em have found no benefit; wherefore, according to this Writer, this Touch must be an established Remedy. On the other hand, I say, if any one has tried it without Benefit, this is full proof against it, unless some sufficient Reason can be given why it should not succeed in this particular Instance. The like may be urged with respect to the Pestilence.

Refuter, p. 62. ' If it be farther urged, that tho
' some Persons have been near the Sick, and have
' not been infected, this may be attributed to the
' Strength and Vigour of their Constitutions; I
' answer, it has never been remarked, that such
' only have escaped.

Remark. ' This is perverting a true Answer in-
' to a ridiculous one. This is never ascribed to a
' general State of sound Health and Strength, but
' always to some more secret Disposition contrary
' to the noxious Vapour. And that this is no ex-
' travagant Supposition, every Day's Experience
' shews us in the Case of the Small Pox; for every
' one who has once passed thro that Distemper,
' has afterwards got a Disposition by which he is

ever after protected from Infection by it; whether he remain of a strong or of a weak Constitution; and no reason can be given, why some may not naturally have, in respect to the Plague, what all acquire in regard to the Small-Pox, by going thro the Disease.

Note. Dr. Hodges speaking of the Signs foregoing the Pestilence says, 'Whensoever Chronick Diseases are changed into acute Ones, it may be concluded the Infection is not far off; for *Valerians* are more sensible of any approaching Disorder than those who are strong and *healthful* — And the more virulent any infectious *Miasmata* are, the sooner do they affect such Habits; and it seems peculiar to the Plague to be preceded by its pernicious *Effluvia*, like so many Officers seizing the Weak and Helpless first.' What can this Remarker say to this Passage? Does not Dr. Hodges here make the strong and healthy less subject than the weak and ailing? But at this time it is thought more for his Purpose to deny it; and a Disposition contrary to the noxious Vapour is supposed; such like as he conceives People acquire against the Small-Pox, by going thro the Disease, that is, Because People do acquire a Disposition not subject to the Small-Pox by going thro the Disease, therefore some may have such a Disposition with respect to the Plague without going thro the Disease. There might have been some little Appearance of his being in the right, if he had supposed such only to have this Disposition as had recovered of any Pestilential Disease. But neither would this have served his present turn, nor indeed would there have been any Truth in it; for there are many Instances of People that have been seized twice even during the same Pestilence: Moreover at *Digne in France*, as the Fact is related

red by *Gassendus*, out of 10000 Inhabitants but five or six escaped having the Disease : And at those Places in *Turkey* where the Pestilence rages so very frequently, there can be no great numbers that can possibly have a natural or acquired Disposition of this Kind ; for if there were, the Pestilence would soon want Subjects to act upon. But we find in some Pestilences the Rich have mostly escaped, in others the Poorer sort ; in some the Elder, and in others the Younger People ; in some the Males, and in others the Females. This cannot be from any one Disposition either natural or acquired. The Truth of it is this, This Writer with his Patron and some few others having got it into their Heads that the Pestilence is always one and the same Disease, they would likewise suppose one Disposition capable of securing always against it ; whereas we find it otherwise in Fact, and that very Disposition, which secures against one, exposes People most to another Pestilence : whence it is evident that different Pestilences are different Diseases.

Refuter, §. 8. p. 64. ' When People die, either they have not at all discharged it (the Matter of the Disease) or not in any great Quantity ; for if they had they would recover.

Remark. ' Why so ? May not a very great Quantity be discharged, and yet enough retained to kill ?

Note. It is not probable.

Refuter, p. 64, 65. ' It (the Matter of the Sickness) is never so (by insensible Perspiration, or by Breathing) discharg'd. This is evident, because sick Persons are never recovered by means of an increased Perspiration, or by Breathing ; nor do they ever find Relief thereby.

Remark. ' This is boldly said ; but how does it appear, that no Relief is had this Way? may not all who recover perspire more than usual? There is no Instance indeed of any being recovered by insensible Perspiration only. Perhaps this is never sufficient to carry off the whole of the Disease. But does not Dr. Sydenham teach us, that violent Sweating is the very best Cure of it?

Note. If what Dr. Pye has said be true, 'tis enough. Insensible Perspiration and Sweating are very different Discharges; and he has shewn, that Sweating is not capable of communicating the Disease.

Refuter, p. 67. ' Nurses and such as have constantly attended on the Sick, have escaped much better than any others.

Remark. ' This is a hardy Assertion to be set down thus without Proof. If it is true, perhaps the Observation of *Diemerbroeck* will explain it, ' That in the Plague at *Nimeguen* old People escaped better than others.

Note. Dr. Pye says—— ' And indeed, the All-wise and Prescient Author of Nature seems, in a particular manner, to have provided against this dreadful Inconvenience, that we might not be deterred from yielding Assistance to our fellow-Creatures; when labouring under the more violent Diseases, they are thereby rendered helpless to themselves, and must inevitably perish, if help from others be denied them. But infinite Goodness, ever careful of the Welfare of his Creatures, has joined Safety and Security with their Duty; and therefore has so ordered and constituted things, that the Matter of the several Diseases with which Mankind is afflicted, especially of the more Violent and Malignant, is

is always discharged in such Form and Manner, and so blended and diluted with other Humours generally of a viscid or gelatinous Kind, that those Persons who shall perform the necessary Offices about the Sick, are not by that means liable to any Injury: Instead of that, as far as I can learn, and by enquiry it will be found, that Nurses and such as have constantly attended on the Sick, have escaped much better than any others.

This Writer every where chuses to quote Things unfairly.

Refuter, *ibid.* 'Some of the Antients prescribed Amulets of Arsnick, &c.

Remark. 'This is a Blunder, in mistaking *Dar-sini*, in the Translators of the *Arabian Physicians*, for *De Arsenico*; which *Dr. Mead* has long since shewn the Folly of. *Essay on Poisons*, p. 126.

Note. May not *Densfingius*, from whom *Dr. Mead* says this, be mistaken as well as the Translators? But *Dr. Pye* has not confined it to the *Arabians*.

Refuter, p. 68. 'Other violent Fevers, especially such as are termed Putrid, proceed in the same Way and Manner as Plague-Fevers.

Remark. 'These Fevers do never produce either Pestilential Buboes, or Carbuncles, without which this Writer has but three Pages before (p. 65.) affirmed no one in *France* to have recovered of the Plague. This then is another Contradiction.

Note. *Dr. Pye* does not say, that other putrid Fevers produce pestilential Buboes: But as they produce Buboes, &c. whenever such Fevers become popular and general, and therefore pestilential, the same Buboes will then be pestilential ones.

Refuters

Refuter, *ibid.* 'In all the more violent Fevers, those Glands, (*viz.* of the Mouth) are always empty, whence the Mouth is dry and clammy.

Remark. 'This Dryness proceeds not from the Emptiness of those Glands, but from the Tenacity of these Juices, by which the Glands are stuffed.

Note. They are likewise empty, as every one's Experience will evince: But the Tenacity is still more to Dr. *Pye*'s Purpose; for such tenacious Matter cannot be carried along with the Breath, if it were infectious; which Dr. *Pye* has proved is not.

Refuter, p. 69. 'As to those who die, the Disease may be said to have no latter End.

Remark. 'But very absurdly; for is not the Disease ended, when the Person is dead? and if so, is not a little before Death the latter End of it? But let Dr. *Mead* explain himself, who in his *Essay on Poisons* uses (in p. 174.) the Phrase here quibbled upon, and in p. 175. this other Expression, *the last Moments*, nearly in the same Sense.

Note. See Dr. *Pye*'s Explanation in the Words immediately following; and the Absurdity will soon disappear.

Refuter, *ibid.* 'All malignant Fevers are said to throw off these Particles.

Remark. 'What Particles? not infectious; they are only called by Dr. *Mead* active; but in Pestilential Cases they are indeed infectious, as Dr. *Mead* rightly distinguishes, at p. 12. of his Discourse, which is the Place here referred to by this *Refuter*.

Note. Dr. *Mead* has not shewn, why these active Particles are infectious in pestilential, and not so in malignant Cases.

Refuter, *ibid.* ' If Diseases discharged by Buboës can be communicated in the Way I have been considering, the Venereal Disease would be so communicated.

Remark. ' This, sure, is the Master-piece of this Writer's Reasoning; for he is here more than ordinarily unhappy in the Choice of his Instance, the Disease he mentions being it self infectious: And surely the meanest Capacity might have seen it not to be improbable, that if there is one Distemper that often discovers it self by Buboës, and is infectious in a certain Degree; there may be also another Disease, attended likewise with Buboës, that may be infectious in a still greater Degree, and that the Plague is generally thought to be.

Refuter, p. 69. ' But it is very manifest the Venereal Disease is not infectious to the Bystanders, nor by Contact, except Venereal.

Remark. ' This is not so; For Children and their Nurses will communicate this Disease to each other.

Note. What Dr. Pye has said is such a Master-piece of Reasoning, as this Writer will not be able to overthrow: He allows the Venereal Disease to be infectious; but not to the Bystanders, nor by external Contact. The manner, therefore, by which the Disease is discharged, being the same in both, it may be supposed, that being alike received into the Body, one may taint or infect in a more violent degree than the other; but it does not follow that it should therefore infect in a quite different way, viz. at a distance.

Refuter, p. 70. ' If Plague Sickneses, discharged by Sweat, can therefore be communicated to Persons near, all other Sickneses discharged that way would be infectious too.

Re-

Remark. ' This is no Consequence; Plagues do not seize on others, because such as are sick of them have Discharges by Sweat, but by reason such Discharges are infectious.

Note. But no Reason is, or can be given, why Sweat should not be communicative or infectious in malignant, as well as in pestilential Fevers.

Refuter, §. 9. p. 70. ' If any kind of Matter, Venom, or Poison, is capable of producing a Disease, which can be communicated to others, &c. Sublimate Mercury, Arsenic, the Venom of Vipers, or of mad Dogs, &c. would cause such Sickneses.

Remark. ' How does it appear, because some Poisons will do this, therefore all must? By the same way of Reasoning it would follow, that Opium does not kill by inducing Sleep; because Sublimate Mercury, Arsenic, the Venom of Vipers, or of mad Dogs, &c. which are all Poisons as well as Opium, have not that Effect.

Note. This Writer should have learnt better by what means Opium kills, before he had taken upon him to be a Remarker: The inducing Sleep is not the Effect of it considered as a Poison.

Refuter, *ibid.* ' If any kind of Damps, Vapours, or *Effluvia*, are capable of producing an infectious Sicknes, then Chymical *Effluvia*, or the Damps and Vapours of Mines, or Pits, &c. would cause such Sicknes.

Remark. ' This is no better Reasoning than the former.

Note. Many Authors have been of opinion, that Pestilences are very often occasioned by the Steams arising from Mines, by Arsenical or Mercurial Exhalations floating in the Air, or the like: and Dr. Mead tells us, from *Diogenes Laertius*, of a Pestilence from the Putrefaction of a River, which

had little or no Current. As to Pestilences that have had their rise from any of the preceding Causes, the Argument taken from the Nature of Poisons, proves undeniably that they are not infectious to Persons standing near the Sick. And forasmuch as not any one Venom or Poison, that has ever been known or discovered, is capable of producing a communicative Distemper, we may very reasonably presume there is no such thing in Nature, especially since not the least Evidence has been, or, as far as I perceive, can be given, that such Poison does any where exist.

It may not be amiss to insert in this Place what Dr. Mead himself has said concerning this occult Poison, in his *Essay of Poisons*, p. 167, &c. He is here treating of venomous Exhalations from the Earth, poisonous Airs, and Waters: and having shewn that *Hippocrates* and *Galen* ascribed Pestilences to the Constitution of the Air, he goes on ;
 • *Lucretius* is of the same mind, for in his admirable Description of the Plague of Athens, These
 • Diseases, says he, either come from the Air, or arise
 • from the Earth. In short, the general Histories
 • of Epidemick Distempers, do almost constantly
 • confirm thus much ; and would have done it
 • more, if the vain Notion of occult Venoms had
 • not prepossessed the Minds of Authors, and made
 • them regardless of the manifest Causes. What may
 have since induced this Gentleman to come into the very Notion he had thus rallied and condemned, is known to himself alone ; for he has not thought fit to give the Publick the least Reason for it.

If insulting will do it, this Writer has entirely overthrown Dr. Pye's Arguments ; but he should remember withal, that insulting without Reason, is the greatest Affront imaginable to his Readers Understanding.

Refuter, p. 71. ' The Mortality at the Assize
' at Oxford, &c. was certainly, for the Extent of
' it, one of the most cruel and deadly Pestilen-
' ces, &c. and yet they (the Persons infected)
' did not communicate the Sickneſs to any other.

Remark. ' This does not appear to have been
' the true Plague; for there is no Account of any
' Pestilential Tumours or Carbuncles appearing
' upon any ſeized; no wonder therefore if it was
' not ſo infectious.

Note. Was not that a terrible Peſtilence which
ſeized and killed ſo great a Number of Perſons
almoſt all that were within the Extent of it?
yet becauſe there is no Account of Buboës or
Carbuncles, this Writer will not have it a true
Peſtilence; ſo that according to his way of arguing
moſt of the great and remarkable Peſtilences that
have happen'd in the World were no true
Peſtilences. Dr. Pye has ſhewed very clearly in
his Diſcourſe, that any Diſeaſe which rages
with more than ordinary Violence, and de-
ſtroys very great numbers of People, is truly a
Peſtilence: but this Remarker being a conſtant
Follower may poſſibly be under a neceſſity of be-
ing incorrigible.

I might paſs by the Paſſages he has picked out
of the ſecond Part of Dr. Pye's Diſcourſe, ſince
they do not ſo immediately concern the main Ar-
gument: however as there are but four or five,
I ſhall juſt take notice of them.

He, ſays this Remarker, ſhould have diſproved
all the Accounts that favour Dr. Mead's Notion;
as a Right Reverend Biſhop has done it in rela-
tion to Witches. He has already diſproved thoſe
Dr. Mead urged; and all the other Accounts I
have ever heard, are ſo ſilly and abſurd, that let
Dr. Mead or any other Perſon ſelect as many as
they

they please; if Dr. Pye does not, I will venture to take upon me to disprove them. But I am apt to think they will appear so ridiculous, when they come to be reconsidered, that no one will print a Collection of them, and own it publicly when he has done.

I would have this Writer consider whence it is that two solid Bodies with polished Surfaces adhere so firmly together, as not to be separated without a considerable Force; this perhaps may lead him to comprehend what Dr. Pye has said in relation to the Fluids.

Dr. Pye seems to intend a particular Treatise upon Blood-letting; and if so, I doubt not but he will firmly establish what he has here laid down.

This Remarker says, 'He [Dr. Pye] talks against the Abuses of Blisters in such a manner, as shews he knows but little what is really to be expected from them.' What he has said concerning the Abuse of Blisters, is—— There is one thing more I shall take notice of, and that is the Practice of Blistering, which of late prevails so much, that Blisters are now applied almost in all Cases whatsoever, often improperly, and much oftner without measure or proportion. People seem not to have any Notion that Blistering can be overdone, or that too great Discharges can be made this way: but this is a mischievous Error; for with respect to external Applications, as well as internal Medicines, there must be a proper *Quantum*, any thing beyond which is Excess. I would have it therefore be observed, that Blisters may not be proper in every Plague, no more than in all other Distempers; and even when they are, that then they may be used in undue Measure, or to Excess.

Could any thing more be expected in so few

Words? May not a Medicine so active and stimulating, and attended with large Discharges, be used improperly, where no Stimulus or Discharge is required? can it not be applied in undue Measure or to Excess? and is it not many times so used and applied? If it be, then he has given us a very proper and necessary Caution.

As to what is said against the burning a great number of Candles at once, this Writer rather confirms than overthrows it.

In the 30th Page this Remarker finds these Words, ' If any Judgment can be made from the present Nature of our Climate and other Circumstances, there never can happen a Plague here in *England*, in which Blood-letting will not be found pernicious and fatal.' Hereupon he triumphs exceedingly, but with very little Cause; as will soon be seen; for all his Merriment is founded upon a Supposition that Blood-letting is proper in a Pleurisy, and that the Pleurisy may possibly affect so generally as to become a Pestilence, according to the Doctor's own Definition. Very well; and what then? Does Dr. *Pye* say there never can be a Pleuritick Pestilence, or a Pestilence in which Blood-letting may be useful? No such thing. All he says is, that ' If any Judgment can be made, and so far as any Judgment can be made, from the present Nature of our Climate and other present Circumstances, there never can happen &c.' He does not so much as affirm positively that any such Judgment can be made, nor that the present Nature of our Climate and other Circumstances, may not possibly vary and change. It is therefore his Opinion only that as far as a Judgment can be made from them, a Pestilence will never happen here in *England*, wherein Blood-letting will not be pernicious: Can this Remarker deduce

deduce from the present Nature of our Climate and other present Circumstances, that such a Pestilence will happen here? Till he has done this he does not in the least contradict what Dr. Pye has said in this Place. Moreover he may learn from *Micrus*, that in a Pestilence *Anno 1564.* the Disease many times seized the *Pleura* and Lungs, occasioning Pleurifies and Peripneumonies; and yet even in those cases Blood-letting was then found injurious. And tho *Sydenham* does seem to think that Blood-letting might be of use, yet since he fled soon after the Pestilence broke out, what he says could not be founded on much Experience; whereas Dr. *Hodges*, who continued and practised in the City all the time the Pestilence lasted, does assure us from repeated Experience, that it was found pernicious and fatal.

Dr. *Pye* says, It is more probable People should find Safety by attending on the Sick, than that they should receive hurt by so doing, and not that they certainly will find Safety in it. This he founds on Fact; for he says, that upon Enquiry he has been informed that Nurses, &c. have escaped better than others; which likewise may be gathered from Dr. *Hodges* *.

In accounting for this Fact indeed he supposes, that Bodies of like kind do attract each other; which this Remarker does not deny: and since Dr. *Hodges* observed that the Matter of the Pestilence, and the Matter of the Venereal Disease attracted each other †; Why may not the Matter of the Disease have that Power with respect to the Cause of the Pestilence? And why then may not the Fact abovementioned be accounted for this way? He no where fancies an infected Body to resemble

* Quincy's Edit. of *Hodges* p. 8, 106, 134, &c.

† Quincy's Edit. of *Hodges* p. 77.

or to have any Properties peculiar to Arsenic, as this Writer falsely suggests; which the Reader may be satisfied of by perusing Dr. Pye's own Words, to which I refer him.

The Remarker closes this Section with the following Words, 'Does it follow (granting his Principles) that one sitting near a Fire with a Door open at his Back can receive no Injury, by reason the Fire draws to itself the whole Current of Air? Certainly these are no Consequences at all.' Had he been ever so little acquainted with Natural Philosophy, he would have known, that tho' the Air does press into a Chimney in which a Fire is burning, it is not by virtue of any attractive Power in the Fire, whereby it draws the Air to itself; for that on the contrary Fire forces the Air to fly from it: Wherefore if he would have shewn by other Instances the Inconclusiveness of what Dr. Pye has said, in relation to the Attraction of Pestilential Matter he should have done it by parallel Instances, and where there really is a Power of Attraction; whereas this he has here urged is no such Instance, and can shew nothing but his own Ignorance and that of his Revisers.

The Conclusion or remaining three Pages of this Pamphlet are taken up partly in vilifying two of the Treatises, and the Authors of them, and partly in proclaiming the Praises of Dr. Mead; which therefore I shall let pass without notice: for 'tis not my Design to lessen or detract from any Man's Character. And as to the several Discourses, I would have People compare them together and judge for themselves.

But the Method this Remarker has used thro' the Course of his Pamphlet to vindicate Dr. Mead and expose his Antagonist, is so very extraordinary, that it deserves some particular regard; for whereas he

he should have considered the several Evidences brought against Dr. *Mead's* Notions, one after the other, having first reported each fairly and fully; and should then have shewn that they were defective and insufficient, to make good what they were urged for; or at least what was necessary to be prov'd: he has omitted several Arguments entirely, and such as were the most convincing; and has only picked out here and there a piece of a Sentence or a Scrap of an Argument, and these very often sadly misreported and misrepresented; upon which thus disjointed and mangled, he makes his Remarks.

By this Method he could not fail of rendring his Antagonists in many Places absurd and ridiculous, even tho they had been the greatest Men that had ever taken Pen in hand: And it may be conceived he flattered himself, that his Readers would not take the Trouble of turning to, and reading over, the Passages and Arguments entire, as they stand in the Discourses referred to; which if they should do, his Remarks would generally appear trifling and ill grounded, without the help of Notations, &c.

However this their way of proceeding, disingenuous and base as it is, may serve to convince the World, either that Dr. *Mead's* Notions are not defensible against the Arguments made use of to refute them, or at least that the Persons concerned in this Pamphlet thought they were not; and therefore found themselves under a Necessity of either giving them up, or if they were resolved to maintain them, to do it at the expence of their Honour and Veracity.

If Dr. *Mead* or any other Person is still of opinion that his Notions are justifiable and right, let him vindicate them by all means; but let this be done in a fair and rational Manner, and let him openly

penly avow his Performance by setting his Name at length on the Frontispiece of it. And indeed the Scheme Dr. Mead has advanced upon his Notions, and which he has laboured to have established, has been shown by Dr. Pye, so mischievous and inhuman, that it is highly incumbent on him, and is even a Duty he owes to the Publick, not to be dispensed with, to set about the Justification of it; or if he finds that cannot be done, he is obliged in Justice to Mankind to acknowledge his Mistake, and forthwith do all he can to prevent any farther Proceedings upon so pernicious a Scheme. But if rather than pursue Ways just and honourable, any one shall think it more expedient to endeavour by clandestine and fallacious Arts to suppress and bear down the Truth, I doubt not but all Attempts of that Kind will be baffled and exposed; for great is the Power of Truth, and it will prevail against the Artifices of its Opposers.

F I N I S.

